Of

## WITNESSES

Defense! Witnesses	Fage
TSUGITA, Daisaburo	29645
Direct by Hr. HANAI	29645
(Witness excused)	29653
INO, Hiroya	29657
Direct by Mr. HANAI	29657
Cross by Mr. Comyns Carr	29660
NOON RECESS	29660
Redirect by Mr. HANAI	29662
(Witness excused)	29663
HORINOUCHI, Kensuke	29667
Direct by Mr. YAMAOKA	29667
Question by the President of the Tribunal, Sir William Webb	29710

Of

# EXHIBITS

Doc.	Def.	Pros.	Description For Ident.E	In vidence
2162	3248		Stenographic Record of the House of Feers at the 67th Session of the Imperial Diet 25 January 1935 - Answer of the Minister of State HIROTA, Koki	29601
2153	3249		Answer of Foreign Minister HIROTA to a question in the House of Represent- atives at the 67th Session of the Imperial Diet on 21 February 1935	29608
2154	3250		Minutes of the Proceedings of the Committee of the House of Representatives Closing Accounts at the 67th Session of the Imperial Diet 1 March 1935	29611
1429	3251		ed between Japanese Foreign Minister HIROTA and Soviet People's Commissar for Foreign Affairs Litvinov in Celebration of the Signing of the Agreement concerning the North Man- churian Railway	29612
250	3252		Statement taken from Litvinov's "Foreign Policy of the Soviet Union", published by the State Publishing Institute, Moscow, 1937	29616

Of

EXHIBITS

(cont'd)

The second secon	Def.	Pros.	Description For Ident.Ev	In idence
2216	3253		Telegram sent by Mr.  HIROTA, Minister for Foreign Affairs on 5 August 1935 and address- ed to the Japanese Ambassador to China, Japanese Charge d'Affaires at Peiping, Japanese Consul-Generals at Tientsin and Nanking	29621
2217	3254		Telegram sent by Mr. HIROTA, Minister for Foreign Affairs on 28 September 1935 and addressed to the Japanese Ambassadors in China, Manchukuo, Japanese Charge d'Affaires at Pei- ping, Japanese Consul- Generals at Tientsin, Tsinan, Tsingtao, Nanking, Hankow, Foochow, Amoy and Canton	29625
2218	3255		Telegram sent by Mr. HIROTA, Minister for Foreign Affairs on 4 October 1935 and addressed to the Japanese Ambassadors in China, Manchukuo, Japanese Charge d'Affaires at Pei- ping, Japanese Consul- Generals at Tientsin, Tsinan Tsingtao, Nanking, Hankow, Foochow, Amoy and Canton	, 29629

Of

EXHIBITS

(cont'd)

No.	Def.	Pros.	Description	For In Ident. Evider
2221	3256		Nanking Telegram dated 14 November 1935 arriving at the Japan Foreign Office on 15 November addressed to Foreign Minister HIRO from Consul-General S at Nanking	OTA
979	3257		Two telegrams dated 21  November 1935 from Co General SUMA to Forei Minister HIROTA - Rep of a Conversation bet the Japanese Ambassad China ARIYOSHI and Ch Kai-shek	gn oort ween lor to
2			MORNING RECESS	29639
2603	3258		Affidavit of TSUGITA, Daisaburo	29648
2596	3259		Affidavit of INO, Hiroy	ra 29658
2146	3260		Afridavit of HORINOUCHI Kensuke	29682
			AFTERNOON RECESS	29686
2536	3261		Affidavit of HAYASHI, K	aoru 297 <b>6</b> 7

# Tuesday, 30 September 1947

INTERNATIONAL MILITARY TRIBUNAL FOR THE FAR EAST Court House of the Tribunal War Ministry Building Tokyo, Japan

The Tribunal met, pursuant to adjournment, at 0930.

## Appearances:

For the Tribunal, all Members sitting, with the exception of: HONORABLE JUSTICE R. B. PAL, Member from India, not sitting from 1330 to 1600 and HONORABLE JUSTICE I. M. ZARYANOV, Member from the USSR., not sitting from 1500 to 1600.

For the Prosecution Section, same as before.

For the Defense Section, same as before.

(English to Japanese and Japanese to English interpretation was made by the Language Section, INTFE.)

23 24

8

9

10

11

12

15

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

25

.

K p

& K p e a

MARSHAL OF THE COURT: The International Military Tribunal for the Far East is now in session.

THE PRESIDENT: "With the Tribunal's permission 4 the accused TOJO will be absent from the courtroom for 5 the first half of the morning session conferring with 6 counsel.

#### . Vamaoka.

MR. YAMAOKA: May it please the Tribunal, we 9 offer in evidence defense document 2162. This is an official stenographic record of an answer made by Mr. HIROTA in the House of Peers at the 67th Session of the Imperial Diet on January 25, 1935. I desire to state that we intend to read only the first paragraph of this document and the first sentence and the last sentence of the last paragraph on the page.

THE PRESIDENT: Admitted on the usual terms. CLERK OF THE COURT: Defense document 2162 will receive exhibit No. 3248.

(Thereupon, the document above referred to was marked defense exhibit 3248 and received in evid ce.)

MR. YAMAOKA: I also wish to state, if the Tribunal please, that the mere omission of certain parts of these documents does not mean that we do not intend to rely on them.

15

16

18

19

17

20

22

THE PRESIDENT: Fore than one Member of this
Tribunal has raised the question why you should not read
all that you rely upon in these documents. If you don't
think a part is worth reading, it is possible that those
Members will not read any more than appears in the transcipt
or consider any more than that.

MR. COMYNS CARR: If my friend had said in the beginning what he said just now, we should have objected to the whole of this document as being repetitious.

It was only because of what he said earlier that we thought it would be quicker not to object than to object.

THE PRESIDENT: I'r. Yamaoka.

18 PR. YAMAOKA: I had hoped, if the Tribunal
19 please, to avoid reading certain parts of these documents
15 which had previously been covered by similar statements on
16 other occasions by the accused HIROTA, in the desire not
17 to burden the Tribunal any more than necessary with de18 tails.

THE PRESIDENT: Read what you propose to read, Fr. Yamaok.

MR. YAMAOKA: Then I shall read the parts announced by me originally of this exhibit, defense exhibit 3248.

"STENOGRAPHIC RECORD OF THE HOUSE OF PEERS AT THE 67TH SESSION OF THE IMPERIAL DIET. 25 JANUARY 1935.

"Answer of the Minister of State. Minister of State, Nr. Koki HIROTA.

"Turther, the question as to what is the fundamental idea of the Japanese foreign policy towards the United States. Great Britain and other countries, I should like to answer as follows. Unfortunately, Japan has been compelled to withdraw from the League of Nations owing to the Manchurian Incident, but this does not mean that Japan has separa d herself from the whole world. The League of Nations is a place of conference and not to attend the conference does not mean that the diplomatic relations between Japan and those countries which compose the conference will be severed at once."

I shall skip to the last paragraph:

"In connection with the diplomatic relations with the United States and Great Britain, there is the problem of naval disarmament."

I skip to the last line:

13

14

15

17

18

19

21

22

23

24

25

"If you inquire how I intend to deal with this problem in the future, I would answer, of course, Japan will follow a policy of peace and at this time I feel greatest reluctance even to speculate at this time on measures to be take in case the effort to reach an agreement turns out to be unfruitful."

"e offer in evidence defense document 2168.

This is an answer made by I'r. HIROTA to a question in the Pouse of Pepresentatives at the 67th Session of the Imperial Diet on January 26, 1935. "e intend to read, if the Tribunal please, only the first and third paragraphs of this document.

THE PRESIDENT: Mr. Brown.

to this document as repetitive. In view of the ruling announced by you, Mr. President, that all parts of a document admitted into evidence are part of the evidence, we think it necessary to take objection, however much or little my parned friend may propose to read.

THE PRESIDENT: This morning I stated the attitude of some Members. "hether they are a majority I do not know.

MR. BROWN: I was thinking, your Honor, of your statement the other day that all parts of an exhibit admitted into evidence were part of the evidence, at least in the view of some Members of the Tribunal.

THE PRESIDENT: Mr. Yamaoka.

TR. MAMAOKA: If the Tribunal please, according to the practice to which I have been accustomed, once a document is admitted into evidence the whole document is in evidence.

THE PRESIDENT: But if you don't think it worth while reading a part of a document, the Tribunal may not bother themselves with that part; but I hope that won't encourage you to read the whole of a document in all cases.

Mr. Brown.

10

13

17

22

24

25

MR. BROWN: Your Fonor, might I suggest that at least later some ruling might be given by the Tribunal as to whether parts of these documents not read in evidence may be referred to in summation.

THE PRESIDENT: I know that some parts of documents not read, and which apparently were not thought important at the time, are regarded by at least some Members as very important now in the light of what has happened since. This question arose at Nuernberg, and I think the Court changed its view about the matter at least once. It 16 is by no means simple:

Use your judgment, Mr. Yamaoka, and I am sure you 18 will read only things which you think the Court should know. Now we have to deal with the contention of whether the whole of the document should be rejected. It seems to 21 be repetitive.

MR. YAMAOKA: If the Tribunal please, I don't believe that this third paragraph, for instance, is repetitive. The last clause of that last sentence of that paragraph --

THE PRESIDENT: By a majority the Court sustains the objection and rejects the document. 

MR. YAMAOKA: We offer in evidence defense document 2153. This is an answer of Foreign Minister HIROTA to a question in the House of Representatives at the 67th Session of the Imperial Diet, on February 21, 1935.

I only intend to read from the sentence beginning at the latter part of the page, "I think," to the end.

THE PRESIDENT: Mr. Brown.

MR. BROWN: Your Honor, the prosecution objects to this document as repetitive, and also on the ground that the part which my learned friend proposes to read is entirely opinion.

THE PRESIDENT: There was less than a month between the speech just rejected and this, and they all have the same tenure, to say the least.

MR. YAMAOKA: If the Tribunal please, I do not believe that Mr. HIROTA in his prior speeches mentions the points that I intend to read here, and as for opinion, why, this is the statement of the accused himself, given in answer to an interpellation in the Diet.

Our purpose in introducing documents of this type, which your Honors have no doubt noticed on the order of proof, is to show the consistency of Mr.

HIROTA's position throughout his official career.

THE PRESIDENT: A speech a year would be enough for that purpose. We do not need speeches every three weeks.

MR. YAMAOKA: But if your Honors please, I do not believe that that sentence that begins with "I think" has been covered.

THE PRESIDENT: By a majority, the Tribunal overrules the objection and admits the document to the extent of one sentence, which I will read.

CLERK OF THE COURT: Defense document 2153 will receive exhibit number 3249.

(Whereupon, the document above referred to was marked defense exhibit No. 3249 and received in evidence.)

THE PRESIDENT: The sentence is, "I think there are still Japanese in various fields who have some suspicions of Chinese moves, but for myself, I have not the slightest suspicion of Chiang Kai-shek's attitude."

MR. YAMAOKA: If the Tribunal please, we next offer in evidence defense document 2164. This is a statement of Mr. HIROTA before the Committee of the Budget of the House of Peers at a session of the Imperial Diet on February 25, 1935.

THE PRESIDENT: Mr. Brown.

MR. BROWN: Your Honor, the prosecution objects to this document as repetitive, and consisting of mere vague generalities.

You stated, your Honor, that the Tribunal did not need speeches every three weeks. I would draw attention that this is much less than three weeks. It is four days later.

THE PRESIDENT: Yes, the objection is sustained and the document rejected by a majority.

11

12

15

111

15

11

20

23

2

MR. YAMAOKA: If the Tribunal please, may I respectfully suggest that this question of the Four-Power Pact has not been discussed before in any of his prior speeches?

THE PRESIDENT: Well, that is the decision of the majority.

MR. YAMAOKA: I may, if the Tribunal will permit, point out also that while it is true that some of the Washington treaties were abrogated by Japan, this Four-Power treaty was not abrogated by Japan.

THE PRESIDENT: Yes, Mr. Yamaoka?

MR. YAMAOKA: And this has a bearing upon the course of action Japan took subsequently in failing to attend the Brussels Conference, which --

THE PRESIDENT: Now, here is a pregnant observation, if I may say so, by one of my colleagues:

If the accused HIROTA wishes to prove that he made public statements declaring peaceful purposes, then he has done so abundantly.

MR. YAMAOKA: I may state, if your Honors
please, that these are not the only speeches made by
Mr. HIROTA, nor the answers of Mr. HIROTA to interpellations in the Diet. He has had, oh, many, many
more, out of which --

THE PRESIDENT: Proceed with the next docu-

MR. YAMAOKA: We offer in evidence defense

document 2154. This is the answer of Foreign Minister

HIROTA in the House of Representatives at the 67th

Session of the Imperial Diet, dated March 1, 1935.

We intend to read only the last sentence of paragraph 2 of this document.

THE PRESIDENT: Mr. Brown.

17

19

MR. BROWN: Your Honor, the prosecution objects to this document as being repetitive and consisting of mere vague generalities.

MR. YAMAOKA: If the Tribunal please, I do not believe this statement has previously been included in prior documents of Mr. HIROTA. We further deem

this statem nt to be very material, owing to the fact that the prosecution has charged, particularly in Appendix A of the Indictment, that Japan tried to obtain special privileges in China and to obtain economic domination over China.

THE PRESIDENT: The objection is overruled and the document admitted to the extent of that one sentence.

CLERK OF THE COURT: Defense document 2154 will receive exhibit No. 3250.

(Whereupon, the document above referred to was marked defense exhibit No. 3250 and received in evidence.)

25

MR. YAMAOKA: I shall read defense exhibit 3250 to the extent admitted:

"MINUTES OF THE PROCEEDINGS OF THE COUNTTEE

OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES REGARDING CLOSING AC
COUNTS AT THE 67TH SESSION OF THE IMPERIAL DIET. 1

MARCH 1935.

"Answer of the Minister of State.

"Minister of State HIROTA.

"Moreover, as it would be difficult in present conditions in China to promise special privileges to Japan, I suggested that China should treat Japan in the same manner as other countries, i.e., to take an impartial attitude and extend the same privileges to Japan as extended to other nations."

We offer in evidence defense document 2149.

This consists of telegraphic messages exchanged between Foreign Minister HIROTA and Foviet Peoples Commissar for Foreign Affairs --

THE PRESIDENT: 1429, is it?

IMR. YAMAOKA: Oh, I am sorry, yes: 1429.

In celebration of the signing of the agreement concerning the Chinese Eastern Railway.

THE PRESIDENT: Admitted on the usual terms.

LERK OF THE COURT: Defense document 1429

will receive exhibit No. 3251.

(Whereupon, the document above referred to was marked defense exhibit No. 3251 and received in evidence.)

MR. YAMAOKO: I shall read exhibit 3251:

"The telegraphic messages exchanged between Japanese Foreign Minister HIROTA and Soviet People's Commissar for Foreign Affairs Litvinov in celebration of the signing of the agreement concerning the North Manchurian Railway.

"(1) From Litvinov to HIROTA.

"(Received on March 24, 1935)

"His Excellency K. HIROTA, Minister for Foreign Affairs, Tokyo.

"I learned with much satisfaction of the signi of the agreement concerning C. E. R. Consider it my pleasant duty to convey to you my sincere congratulation on the successful completion of the negotiations in which you personally took so active and fruitful a part. I feel sure that we will continue our further fruitful cooperation for the limitation of any cause for conflicts and misunderstandings between our countries and for the strengthening of really friendly relations between them in the interest of our nations and of general peace.

"Litvinov,

"People's Commissar for Foreign Affairs.

"Moscow, March 23rd.

"(II) From HIROTA to Litvinov. "(Despatched on March 25, 1935) "His Excellency Monsieur M. Litvinov, "People's Commissar for Foreign Affairs, 4 5 Moscow. "Sincere thanks for your telegram. I reci-6 procate the feeling of satisfaction for the successful completion of the negotiations concerning the North Manchurian Railway and I take this opportunity to express my deep appreciation for your steadfast and untiring efforts which contributed so much to the success of the negotiations. The agreement will pro-12 mote cordial relations between the USSR and Manchukuo, 13 14 and a foundation has been laid by this agreement for further development of friendly relations between Japan, 15 16 the USSR and Manchukuo. I firmly believe that the same 17 spirit of conciliation and cooperation as demonstrated in the present negotiations will insure amicable set-19 tlement of other pending questions, thereby further 20 strengthening the basis of peace in East Asia. 21 "K. HIROTA, Minister for 22 Foreign Affairs. 23 24 "Tokyo, March 25." There is a certificate attached, which I

25

shall not read.

We offer in evidence defense document 2505. This is statement taken from Litvinov's 'Foreign Policy of the Soviet Union, published by the State Publication Institute, Moscow, 1937, which shows a statement issued to Japanese correspondents on the significance to Foviet-Japanese relations on the occasion of the signing of the agreement for the sale of the Chinese Eastern Railway on March 14, 1935.

THE PRESIDENT: Mr. Brown.

MR. BROWN: Your Honor, the prosecution objects to this document as irrelevant. It is suggested that it is merely the sort of polite statement which it is customary to make when any international agreement is reached and that it proves nothing.

THE PRESIDENT: We have no reason to think that diplomats are polite at the expense of truth. The objection is overruled and the document admitted.

CLERK OF THE COURT: Defense document 2505 will receive exhibit No. 3252.

(Whereupon, the document above referred to was marked defense exhibit No. 3252 and received in evidence.) MR. YAMAOKA: I shall read exhibit 3252: "statement to Japanese Correspondents on the Meaning to Foviet-Japanese Relations of the

2

3

4

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

15

14

15

16

17

10

19

20

21

22

23

Initialling of the Agreement on the Chinese Eastern Railway on March 14, 1935.

â

"(Taken from Mr. Litvinov's 'Foreign Policy of the Soviet Union', published by the State Publishing Institute, Moscow, 1937.)

"You ask me to make a remark of evaluation of the initialling of the Agreement on the Chinese Eastern Railway which has just taken place, and to express my opinion on the possible influence of this event on the fate on other problems which interest Japan, or instance, the Fishery Convention and demilitarization of border zones.

"It seems to me that there cannot be different opinions on the point that the Agreement on the Chinese Eastern Railway must be regarded as a solution of one of the most complicated Far Eastern problems, and at the same time as the greatest positive event in the development of Soviet-Japanese relations.

"The Soviet Government testified over ten
years ago to its readiness to dispose of the Chinese
Eastern Railway, entitling China by the Peking Treaty,
1924, to purchase the Railway before the time-limit,
and beginning concrete negotiations on cession of the
Railway to the former de facto regime of Manchuria,
but the Soviet Government was unable to come to the

conviction, under the changes since 1931, that the Chinese Eastern Railway cannot but become an inevitable source of conflicts between the Soviet Union and Japan, and disturb its policy of maintaining peace with all its neighbors. It did not take time for facts ' show the correctness of this supposition, and as a matter of fact, from the first months of the appearance of a new regime in Manchuria there began a series of conflicts between this regime and the Soviet section of the Railway Administration, the conflicts which, in spite of all our love of peace, threatened to bring serious consequences to all sides concerned. That is why I declared on May 2, 1933, to Mr. OTA, the Japanese Ambassador in Moscow, in the name of my Government, our readiness to begin negotiations without delay on the sale of the Chinese Eastern Railway to Manchukuo. It seems to me that this proposal was one of the clearest manifestations of the Soviet Government's love of peace, and has been received as such by the whole world, not excluding Japan.

1

2

3

4

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

"Looking upon the sale of the Chinese Eastern Railway as one of the sources for strengthening peace in the Far East, the Soviet Government has shown in the commenced negotiations utmost good will and concession, departing, after all, a considerable degree

from the position it at first took. On the other hand, tribute must be paid to the Japanese Manchukuoan side, which gradually has come to meet our concession.

which shows the great difficulties we have had, and we have to attribute their conquest to the efforts on both sides to negotiate and attain the results already noted. In overcoming these difficulties, Mr. HIROTA, Japanese Minister for Foreign Affairs, who has taken active part in all the stages of the negotiations, has rendered no small service. Mr. HIROTA's residence in the Soviet Union in the capacity of Ambassador has no doubt helped establish mutual understanding between Soviet and Japanese participants in the negotiations.

There is a certificate attached, if your Honor please, which I shall not read.

We offer in evidence defense document 206-B (34), an excerpt from Ambassador Grew's Diary, "Ten Years in Japan," to show that in July 1935 Mr. HIROTA was consistent in his efforts to promote good relations between the United States and Japan.

THE PRESIDENT: Mr. Brown.

MR. BROWN: Your Honor, the prosecution objects to this document. The first paragraph, in our submission, is irrelevant. The second and almost the whole of the third paragraph contains merely a statement of HIROTA's stated good intentions. And the last sentence but one of the whole document merely contains Ambassador Grew's opinion of Mr. HIROTA.

is a record of Mr. Grew's conversation with Mr. HIROTA on July 18, 1935 and shows the consistency of his position from the time he assumed the Foreign Ministership about which an excerpt has already been admitted in evidence. This statement is dated July 18, 1935 and shows the consistency throughout. It seems to me, if I may respectfully submit, the actual report of a conversation is clearly admissible.

THE PRESIDENT: By a majority, the objection is sustained and the document rejected.

MR. YAMAOKA: We offer in evidence defense

1 2 3

document 2216. This is a telegram from Foreign Minister HIROTA to the Japanese Ambassador to China and
others in China, dated August 5, 1935, with regard to
the policy towards China.

THE PREFIDENT: Admitted on the usual terms.

CLERK OF THE COURT: Defense document 2216

will receive exhibit No. 3253.

(Whereupon, the document above referred to was marked defense exhibit No. 3253 and received in evidence.)

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

18

19

MR. YAMAOKA: I shall read exhibit 3253:

"Telegram sent by Mr. HIROTA, Minister for Foreign Affairs, on August 5th, 1935, and addressed to Japanese Ambassador to China, Japanese Charge d'Affaires at Peiping, Japanese Consuls-General at Tientsin and Nanking.

"Code telegram Go No. 556 (Confidential).

"With regard to the Policy towards China.

"In view of the recent change of the situation I directed the Bureau concerned since some time
past to conduct, in strict secrecy and toegther with
the Army and the Navy authorities, a fundamental reinvestigation with regard to our policy towards China.
I instructed to present without delay a tentative plan
made by the Bureau of the East Asiatic Affairs (dated

July 2nd) which I am forwarding to you by my separate telegram Go No. 555. On the part of the Army and the Navy there seems to be no objection substantially to the purport of the plan and it is expected that it will be decided upon in the near future. You shall be informed as soon as a decision is arrived at. In the meanwhile you are requested to keep the matter strictly confidential and for your personal information. The present telegram, together with the separate telegram, are addressed to --- (the rest is omitted).

"separate telegram in Code Go No. 555 (Confidential).

"It is the essential point of our foreign policy to secure stabilization in East Asia by means of cooperation and mutual assistance of Japan, Manchukuo and China and it is most important that the three countries should, with this end in view, enter into friendly relations and make necessary cooperation. Herein lies the foundation of our policy towards China. Therefore we are resolved to attain the above object in accordance with the following general principles and in a way best suited to circumstances.

"(1) China should carry out strict control
over all anti-Japanese speeches and activities. At
the same time Japan and China, based upon their special

responsibility with regard to the securing of peace in East /sia, should make efforts to establish and promote the relations of friendship and cooperation on the basis of the principles of mutual respect of independence and cooperation and mutual assistance (such efforts to establish and promote the relations of friendship and cooperation are to be started from the economic and cultural directions), and, making a step further, the two countries should work for the development of the relations between "anchukuo and China.

tween wanchukuo and China makes it its ultimate aim that China will give formal recognition to Manchukuo and that, parallel to this, Japan, wanchukuo and China will conclude a necessary agreement to regulate the new relations between the three countries in accordance with the principles of mutual respect of independence and of cooperation and mutual assistance. However, for the time being, China is to agree not to deny the fact of wanchukuo's existence at least in North China and the Chahar district which border on the Manchukuo territory and to step anti-Manchukuo policy, and, going a step further, to enter into actual relations of interdependence and cooperation in

2.

the economic and cultural fields with Manchukuo.

20.

"(3) In view of the fact that the Bolshevik menace coming from Outer Mongolia and others in a common menace to Japan, "anchukuo and China, cooperation at least between Japan and China should be worked out in Chahar and other districts bordering on Outer Mongolia with a view to removing such menace."

We offer in evidence defense document 2217, being a telegram from Mr. HIROTA, as Minister for Foreign Affairs, on September 28, 1935, addressed to the Japanese embassies in China, "anchukuo, etc. This document shows the text of Japanese policy toward China which was decided upon by the Japanese Government on October 4, 1935 and became popularly known by the name of "HIROTA's Three Principles" towards China.

THE PRESIDENT: Mr. Brown.

MR. BROWN: Your Honor, the prosecution objects to this document as being merely repetitive of the last document read, exhibit 3253.

reply, I desire to point out that the previous exhibit, 3253, was a tentative plan suggested by the Foreign Office. That plan was ultimately changed to the one contained in this document by the decision of the Foreign Office, Army, Navy, Finance Linister and the

Premier. This would be revealed when the next document on the order of proof is introduced.

THE PRESIDENT: By a majority the objection is overruled and the document admitted on the usual terms.

CLERK OF THE COURT: Defense document 2217 will receive exhibit No. 3254.

(Whereupon, the document above referred to was marked defense exhibit 3254 and received in evidence.)

MR. YAMAOKA: I shall read exhibit 3254:

"Telegram sent by Mr. HIROTA, Minister for
Foreign Affairs, on September 28th, 1935, and addressed
to Japanese Ambassadors in China and in Manchukuo,
Japanese Charge d'Affaires at Peiping, Japanese ConsulsGeneral at Tientsin, Tsinan, Tsingtao, Nanking, Hankow,
Foochow, Amoy and Canton.

"Code telegram Go No. 687 (Confidential)
"With regard to the policy towards China.

"The future policy towards China has been a matter of consideration for some time with the cooperation of the Army and the Navy. As a result of such consideration a draft policy such as I am forwarding to you by my separate telegram Go No. 688 has been made by the Departmental authorities of the Departments of

N

.

Foreign Affairs, War and the Navy, and steps are being taken at present to have it decided as a matter understood by the Ministers of the Departments concerned. You will be further informed as soon as such decision is made. You are requested to keep the matter strictly for your confidential information. You are authorized, however, to give a copy of the present and separate telegrams to the representatives of the Army and the Navy upon their requests.

"The present and the separate telegrams are addressed to - - - (the rest is omitted).

"Separate telegram in Code Go No. 688 (Confidential).

policy to secure stabilization in East Asia and to work for the common prosperity by means of cooperation and mutual assistance by Japan, Manchukuo and China, putting Japan as its center. Herein lies the aim of our policy towards China. To accomplish this aim it is essential first of all to invite China (the central as well as local governments), in accordance with the bellowing principlies and always upholding the great cause of justice and in a way best suited to circumstances, to regulate their relations with Japan and Manchukuo and thereby to bring about a sit-

uation capable of establishing the fundamental relations between Japan, Manchukuo and China.

"(1) China should carry out strict control over all anti-Japanese speeches and activities, and, putting an end to her policy of depending upon European and American countries, she should adopt a friendly policy towards Japan and actually carry out such policy. Further, she should cooperate with Japan on concrete questions.

"(2) Although it is essential that China should ultimately give a formal recognition of Manchakao, but for the time being, China should actually give tacit consent to the independence of Manchakao and cease her anti-Manchakao policy. Furthermore, China should, at least in North China, which is a district bordering on the Manchakao territory, enter into relations of interdependence and cooperation in the economic and cultural fields with Manchakao.

"(3) In view of the fact that the menace of Bolshevik influence coming from Outer Mongolia and others constitutes a common menace to Japan, Manchukuo and China, China should cooperate in taking various measures which Japan desires in the districts bordering on Outer Mongolia in order to remove such menace.

"In the event that the points set forth in the

above-mentioned principles are carried into execution steadily and Japan feels convinced of the sincerity 3 of China with regard to her friendship and cooperation 4 with Japan and Manchukuo, a general agreement to establish the relations of friendship and cooperation 6 between Japan and China shall firstly be concluded and then an agreement necessary for the regulation of the new relations between Japan, Manchukuo and China shall be concluded."

There is a certificate attached, which I shall not read.

13

9

10

11

12

14 15

16

17

18 19

20

21

23

24

We offer in evidence defense document 2218. This is a telegram from Mr. HIROTA, as Minister for Foreign Affairs, dated October 4, 1935, and addressed to Japanese embassies in China, manchukuo and other officials, with regard to the policy towards China. This document shows that the policy involved in the three principles toward China was decided upon by agreement of the Foreign Office, Army, Navy, Finance Minister and Premier OKADA.

THE PRESIDENT: Mr. Brown.

MR. BROWN: Your Honor, the prosecution objects to this document as being merely repetitive of information contained in the exhibit just read.

MR. YAMAOKA: If the Tribunal please, in the previous exhibit, Code Telegram Go No. 687 it is stated that steps are being taken at present to have it decided as a matter understood by the ministers of the departments concerned. Now, this --

THE FRESIDENT: By a majority the objection is overruled and the document admitted on the usual terms.

CLERK OF THE COURT: Defense document 2218 will receive exhibit No. 3255.

(Whereupon, the document above referred to was marked defense exhibit

1.

No. 3255 and received in evidence.)
MR. YAMAOKA: (Reading)

"Telegram Fent by Mr. HIROTA, Minister for Foreign Affairs, on October 4th, 1935, and Addressed to Japanese Ambassadors in China and in Manchukuo, Japanese Charge d'Affaires at Peiping, Japanese Consuls-General at Tientsin, Tsinan, Tsingtao, Nanking, Hankow, Foochow, Amoy and Canton.

"Code telegram Go No. 716 (Confidential)

"With regard to the policy towards China.

ter was decided upon on October 4th exactly as was informed to you by my telegram Go No. 688 and as a matter understood by the Minister for Foreign Affairs, the Minister of War and the Minister of the May. The Prime Minister and the Finance Minister also acknowledged it. In this connection you are requested to keep specifically close connection with this Department with regard to the application of the principles (we are not expecting, however, for the time being, any active application of them in the posts other than the Ambassador to China, and at Manking, Peiping and Tientsin. Accordingly, at Embassy and Consulates-General other than these four it is requested to keep the matter for the present strictly as personal information).

You should also maintain contact with the representatives of the Army and the Navy. The present telegram is addressed to those who were informed by my telegram Go No. 687 (the rest is omitted)."

No. 40, if the Tribunal please, on the order of proof, defense document 2023, will be withdrawn.

2

3

4

5

7

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

We offer in evidence defense document 2221 which is a telegram from Consul-General SUMA at Nanking to Foreign Minister HIROTA dated November 14, 1935.

THE PRESIDENT: Mr. Brown.

MR. BROWN: Your Honor, the prosecution objects to this document as containing merely opinion -merely the opinion of the Consul-General, the Japanese Consul-General, at Nanking of the situation as he saw it and sent to the then Foreign Minister HIROTA. In our submission this is irrelevant to the case of the accused HIROTA.

MR. YAMAOKA: If the Tribunal please, this telegram reports the changed attitude of China toward the ra rochement which was in the making as of that time, and it discloses that one of the principal parties to the discussions and negotiations was almost assassinated. We feel that this evidence will reveal that the failure to have the three principles of Mr. HIROTA carried out in full was not the fault alone of the Japanese.

THE PRESIDENT: By a majority the objection is overruled and the document admitted on the usual terms.

CLERK OF THE COURT: Defense document 2221

24

will receive exhibit No. 3256.

(Whereupon, the document above referred to was marked defense exhibit No. 3256 and received in evidence.)

MR. YAMAOKA: I shall read exhibit 3256:

"Nanking telegram dated November 14, 1935, arriving at the Japanese Foreign Office on November 15.

"Addressed to Foreign Minister HIROTA from Co sul-General SUMA at Nanking.

"Cipher tel. No. 1257. (Confidential)

"The opinions towards Japan within the Nationalist Government have grown hostile suddenly, as my successive telegrams informed you. Communists and other lawless elements are suspected to be at work behind this sudden change.

"As to the attempted assassination of Wang Ching-wei and other various accidents, it is considered necessary, in dealing with them, not to regard them as mere contingents. And if there occurs some more serious event or other in North China besides, there would be no small danger that the pro-Russians, the desperate war advocates, the pro-Europeans and the pro-Americans among the Chinese people might be driven to desperation.

"According to my observation during the recent travel through North China, however, there are signs that some undesirable events may take place agains, the three fundamental points decided at the Cabinet council the other day. Unfortunately, there are fears, again, that the British assistance to China in response to the new monetary system plan, which was suddenly announced, may urge such unfavorable turn of situation. (I am secretly informed of the fact that our mechanized troops are being concentrated at Shanhaikwan for these several days.) Grave events might be caused, if wrong measures are taken. It is therefore desired that proper steps should be taken so that our authorities in North China may act strictly in conformity with the decision of the Cabinet council. I submit my opinion to you, though you may be well aware of the point, in consideration of the recent situation of the Nationalist Government.

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

16

17

18

19

20

21

23

24

25

"(Transmitted to the Embassy at Nanking and the Consulate-General at Tientsin.)"

We offer in evidence defense document 979.

These two telegrams from Consul-General SUMA to

Foreign Minister HIROTA report a conversation between

Japanese Ambassador to China, ARIYOSHI, and Chiang

Kai-shek with respect to the problem of working out an over-all adjustment of relations on the basis of the three principles proposed by Foreign Minister HIROTA.

THE PRESIDENT: Admitted on the usual terms.

CLERK OF THE COURT: Defense document 979

will receive exhibit No. 3257.

(Whereupon, the document above referred to was marked defense exhibit No. 3257 and received in evidence.)

MR. YAMAOKA: I shall read exhibit 3257:

"Telegram dispatched from Nanking, P.M.

November 21; 1935; arrived at this office, P.M. the
same date, from Consul-General SUMA to Foreign Minister

HIROTA, No. 1291-1 (Confidential).

"From Ambassador ARIYOSHI.

"1. Pursuant to the conference previously reported by telegram No. 1290, I asked Chiang, 'What is your opinion on the three principles on improving diplomatic relations recently proposed by Foreign Minister HIROTA?' He quite frankly replied that he completely agreed on the three principles, and had no 'counterproposals' to make (Tang later explained that this 'counterproposals' meant conditions); he was determined to learn Japan's desire immediately, to

discuss the matter concretely, and to carry it out promptly; and he desired that due consideration be given by Japan on the present situation in North China, because if something should happen in North China, discussions on this question will be impossible.

"2. Therefore I asked Chiang, 'According to your opinion, you intend to decide whether you want to carry out the three principles or not on condition that the situation in North China be settled peacefully?' He replied, 'I do not mean to make it a condition, but to begin with the three principles proposed at this time by Japan are closely connected with North China, and accordingly it will naturally be impossible to carry out Articles II and III of the three principles if an incident should break out in North China.' (To be continued)"

This is a continuation; I shall not read the title:

"3. I told him that I was also worried about this point, which was the reason I drew his attention to this North China problem first of all that day, and requested him to take proper measures. Moreover, I told him that I would consult him in the future as to the way of carrying out the three principles. Then, in connection with this, referring to the enforcement

of the silver nationalization law, the theory of a lown, and the problem of Japan-China air communication, I had a conversation with him as reported in the separate telegrams. I also requested him to take measures to check the anti-Japanese atmosphere at various places which resulted from the recent Sailor Incident and the Incident in which Japanese stores were attacked at Shanghai. In addition I said that if the said three principles be enforced immediately, suspicion on the part of Japan will be cleared, and it would be effective in promoting our diplomatic relationship.

"4. Then Chiang replied that there will never be anti-Japanese movements, and that he was by no means anti-Japanese and was sincerely hoping for friendly relations between Japan and China. He told me to feel at ease because the Chinese who loves China would never start an anti-Japanese movement.

"I am transmitting this telegram to Peiping and Tientsin, China."

There is a certificate, if your Honor please, which I shall not read.

MR. YAMAOKA: We now offer for identification
the book entitled "International Situation in 1935",
published by the Japan International Association on
June 14, 1936, and offer in evidence defense document
2270, being an excerpt therefrom. This excerpt shows
the official announcement to the Chinese Foreign
Department at the time ambassadors were exchanged
between Japan and China, in 1935. Prior to this the
two countries merely maintained legations and ministers.

THE PRESIDENT: Mr. Brown.

MR. BROWN: Your Honor, the prosecution objects to this document. It is a statement taken from a book which appears to have no official authority. It quotes a statement in the first sentence that it is a matter of congratulation that the governments of Japan and Chine should have raised their legations to the status of embassies. It goes on to state the appreciation of the Chinese Government of this measure, and the second paragraph contains, apparently, the writer's views on Lr. ARIYOSHI. It is suggested that all of this lacks probative value and it is irrelevant to the case of the accused hirota.

THE PRESIDENT: By a majority, the objection is sustained and the document rejected.

MA. YAMAOKA: If the Tribunel please, I wish

21 22

to announce that No. 44 on our order of proof, defense document 1846, will be withdrawn.

Exhibit 2434 in evidence is referred to and counsel propose to read parts of the document not here-tofore read in evidence. The document contains an important statement by Mr. HIROTA before the House of Representatives at the 68th session of the Diet on January 22, 1936 with respect to the foreign relations of Japan. The part heretofore read into the record begins with the second paragraph and the words "It gives us a great delight", and ended with the words in the second paragraph "till they are perfectly normalized", which is on the second page. I intend to read excerpts from pages 7, 9, 10 and 11.

THE PRESIDENT: Read that after the recess, Mr. Yamaoka. We will recess now for fifteen minutes.

(Whereupon, at 1045 a recess was taken until 1100, after which the proceedings were resumed as follows:)

MARSHAL OF THE COURT: The International Military Tribunal for the Far East is now resumed.

THE PRESIDENT: Mr. Yamaoka.

MR. YAMAOKA: If the Tribunal please, I intend to read the second paragraph on page 7 of the English copy of this exhibit 2434; and on page 9 of the English copy of this exhibit, toward the bottom of the page, the sentence beginning with "To Australia . . ." and continuing to the end of the sentence; that is, the first two lines of page 10 and the second sentence of the first paragraph of page 11.

I shall now read the excerpt on page 7 of this exhibit:

"The establishment of a Joint Committee is now talked about, the Manchurian Government insists, first of all, on the necessity of clarifying the ambiguous border line. The one point we are deeply concerned about in the relations of the three countries is the excessive military preparations on the part of Soviet Russia in her far outlying colony of East Siberia. As this is directly inciting the feeling of not only the Manchurians but also of our people, we are taking every opportunity to demand sincere consideration on this point on the part of Soviet authorities."

Turning to page 9:

"To Australia we sent Ambassador DEBUCHI
to reciprocate the friendly mission of Mr. Latham,
the Foreign Minister of Australia, and also we
made him pay a visit to New Zealand to promote
friendship with that Commonwealth. As for the South
Sea Islands, our Empire looks forward to promoting
amicable relations expecting the development of our
commercial intercourse with them. From this point
of view we heartily hanker after satisfactory
development of the Philippine Commonwealth which
has lately been founded."

And skipping to page 11:

"Last year we were unfortunately obliged to apply the Protective Trade Law on Canadian merchandise, but afterwards a perfect compromise was reached between our country and Canada, our true intention being thoroughly understood by Canada, and to our heartfelt congratulation, we have ceased to apply the law any longer."

We now offer in evidence another excerpt from the diary of Ambassador Grew, "Ten Years in Japan," being defense document 206C(1), which discloses the problems confronting Mr. HIROTA when he was ordered by the Emperor to form a cabinet

n

immediately after the February 26, 1936 Incident. The document reports the conversation between Ambassador Grew and Prime Minister HIROTA immediately after the formation of the new cabinet. We intend to read only from the entry dated March 5, 1936 on page 9.

THE PRESIDENT: Nr. Brown.

MR. BROWN: Your Honor, the prosecution objects to this document. The first eight pages, which my learned friend does not propose to read but which may be regarded as part of the evidence, in our submission are completely irrelevant to the case of HIROTA. It is headed "The Lightning Strikes," but there appears to be nothing short and sharp about it. It is a long account of the February 26, 1936 Incident. As regards the paragraph which it is proposed to read, headed "HIROTA REORGANIZES," on page 9, March 5, 1936, the prosecution wishes to point out that this merely contains Ambassador Grew's opinion of HIROTA and of surrounding events. On page 11, the paragraph beginning ""ith regard to China ... " contains a repetition of HIROTA's three points as regards China. The last paragraph of that same page 11 is, in our submission, irrelevant. It merely gives an account

24

2

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

by Ambassador Grew of what he, Ambassador Grew, said to HIROTA.

MR. YAMAOKA: May it please the Tribunal, we are perfectly willing to delete from this document the first eight pages to the entry dated March 5, 1936.

THE PRESIDENT: You ask us to admit only what you propose to read?

MR. YAMAOKA: Yes, your Honor.

THE PRESIDENT: That is the entry under March 5, 1936?

MR. YAMAOKA: Yes, your Honor. And may
I state further, that also in the entry of March 5,
1936 there are statements of fact contained in this
entry, and in so far as the objection to page 11 is
concerned we are introducing this document to show
that Mr. HIROTA not only propounded these principles
to the various embassies and consulates in China and
other parts of the world as shown by the previous
exhibits, but that he also reiterated the same thing
to Ambassador Grew.

THE PRESIDENT: By a majority the objection is sustained and the document rejected.

MR. YAMAOKA: If the Tribunal please, Mr. HANAI will continue with the case.

- 50

D

.

3

4

2

5

7

8

10

11

12 13

14

16

17 18

19 20

22

21

24

DAISABURO TSUGITA, called as a witness on behalf of the defense, being first duly sworn, testified through Japanese interpreters as follows:

MR. HANAI: Way the witness be shown defense document 2603.

#### DIRECT EXAMINATION

BY LR. HANAI:

- Q Is that your affidavit, bearing your signature?
- A Yes, it is. But I should like to correct one typographical error on a Japanese page. There is a correction to be made in the Japanese text. This has nothing to do with the English version.
- Q Except this correction, are the contents thereof true and correct?
  - A Yes, they are.

MR. HANAI: I now tender defense document 2603 in evidence.

THE PRESIDENT: Mr. Comyns Carr.

MR. COMYNS CARR: May it please the Tribunal, the first part of this affidavit is entirely general and has nothing to do with the case of HIROTA -- the first paragraph. There was a previous affidavit of this witness which was tendered and admitted in the general phase, where it belonged. It was a somewhat

argumentative document relating to the question of the effect of the change in regulation in the time of HIROTA's Cabinet by which a general or admiral on the reserve list could no longer be appointed War or Navy Minister, the argument being that it produced little if any effect. Apparently the witness has now thought up some more illustrations in support of that argument, and in our submission they should have been included, if they are of any value at all, in their proper place; and in accordance with the Tribunal's ruling, general matters should not be dealt with here. The illustration does not relate to anything which occurred at the time when HIROTA was in office.

With regard to that affidavit, exhibit 2366,
I understand it has been put in my friend's list because
my friend, Brigadier Nolan, at the time when that
exhibit was tendered—the witness being then ill and
not available for cross-examination—asked that he be
produce—at some other time. Today, unfortunately,
my friend Brigadier Nolan is absent, unwell, and I am
not familiar with the matters about which he desired
to cross-examine. I would ask, therefore, that the
right to recall the witness for that purpose be preserved in case my friend Brigadier Nolan desires to
exercise it.

10

11 12

13

14

15 16

17

18

19 20

21

23

22

24 25

The document was introduced at page 18,176 of the record -- I am told 18,174.

The position therefore is, I ask that that right be preserved; I ask that paragraph 1 of the new affidavit be rejected; I do not oppose paragraph 2.

THE PRESIDENT: Mr. HANAI.

MR. HANAI: The change in the regulations of the War and Navy Ministries was made during Mr. HIROTA's tenure of office. The prosecution has charged that HIROTA is responsible for the added voice which the army thereby came to exercise in politics, and, therefore, although the change in the regulations themselves belong to the general phase, the change itself has a very important bearing on the individual defense of my client.

Although the event related in the affidavit did not occur during HIROTA's tenure of office, the question of the effect of the change does have a very important bearing on his case, and that effect cannot be illustrated unless examples are cited.

And the question of whether Brigadier Nolan is or i. not present today in order to cross-examine this witness has no bearing on the presentation of this evidence. The appearance of this witness has been shown on our order of proof for some days past, and

I should like to add, your Honor, that we have no object 1 to the recalling of this witness at a later stage.

THE PRESIDENT: By a majority, the objection is overruled and the document admitted in toto on the usual terms.

CLERK OF THE COURT: Lefense document 2603 will receive exhibit No. 3258.

(Whereupon, the document above referred to was marked defense exhibit No. 3258 and received in evidence.)

. .

Wolf & Lefler

MR. HANAI: I shall read exhibit 3258.

Before commencing reading this affidavit,
however, I should like to make one correction in the
English text, last line on page. "Lord Keeper of the
Privy Seal YUZAWA" should read "YUASA," Y-u-a-s-a.

(Reading)

#### "SWORN DEPOSITION

"Having first duly sworn an oath as on the attached sheet in accordance with the procedure prevailing in my country, I hereby depose as follows:

"(1) I have deposed, in my affidavit, exhibit
No. 2366, about the reform of the system of the War and
Navy Ministries. In spite of the reform, however, there
was a way left for those on the reserve list to be
appointed War or Navy Minister. The following instance
may be of service in proving it.

of General UGAKI, Kazushige, when he received the Imperial mandate. He received the Imperial command at Nagaoka, Shizuoka Prefecture, on the night of January 24, 1937, and immediately returned to Tokyo in a motor car. On that occasion he was warned by a gendarmerie officer on his way to the Imperial capital that the Army would raise an objection to his forming Cabinet, which proved to be true as soon as he set about

the Inspector-General of Military Education called on him and advised him to give up the idea of forming the Cabillat. It was hardly possible now to appoint a War Minister, and this proved fatal to the formation of his Cabinet. In this way, many of his surroundings came to think that, under such circumstances, there was nothing for it but to give up all thoughts of forming a Cabinet. But, General UGAKI did not change his mind. He proceeded to the Imperial Palace on January 27, saw Lord Keeper of the Privy Seal YUASU and reported to him the progress of his negotiations with the Army. On that occasion, General UGAKI asked for his advice, suggesting to take either of the following three countermeasures for the Army's veto:

"1. To form a cabinet with the position of War Minister left unfilled, and then have the Premier take the charge of the War Minister's business in accordance with the provisions concerning the system of Cabinet.

"2. To appoint some well-qualified general or lieutenant-general from the reserve list as War Minister after placing him again on the active list.

"3. To ask His Majesty to order some wellqualified general or lieutenant-general on the active list to co-operate as War Minister.

"The Lord Keeper of the Privy Seal, however, replied to the effect that he feared that either of the three countermeasures would trouble the Emperor, and that he had not the heart to put His Majesty to such trouble. He added further that the difficulty concerning the appointment of the War Minister from the viewpoint of the system of Government organization was out of the question and that the key of the problem lay in the strong opposition of the Army. And he revealed that he feared, even if the General succeeded in forming the Cabinet, it would be doomed to collapse soon owing to the Army's opposition. It was impossible for General UGAKI to request to be received in audience by His Majesty and ask for the Imperial decision in this connection. Thus he gave up all his hope and excused himself formally on January 29.

attending the general resignation of the HIROTA
Cabinet. In March, 1936, the HIROTA Cabinet was
formed. In May of the same year, the House of Representatives passed a resolution concerning the reform
of the Porliamentary system, and in July, the Government est blished the Parliamentary System Investigating Committee. Towards the end of October, the Army's

18

20

6

7

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

21

23

opinion pertaining to the reform of the Farliamentary system was published in newspapers, which evoked a great deal of comment and criticism. Especially, the delegates of the House of Representatives who had the majority in the Committee were indignant at it, saying that this was a retrogressive step in constitutional government. The Committee requested the presence of the War Minister at its meeting on December 2 and plied him with many questions with respect to the above opinion of the Army, but it seemed that the replies of the War Minister failed to satisfy the Committee.

into the session which the Diet resumed after recess on January 21, the following year, and developed into Mr. HAMADA's interpellation, demanding the resolution of <a href="https://hamapater.com/hamakiri">hamakiri</a> of the War Minister. Thereupon, the War Minister demanded the dissolution of the House of Representatives, but the Government rejected it out of respect to the Parliamentary system, asking the Imperial function to recess for two days. The Government expected that the excitement on both sides might be quieted in the course of time. But, the War Minister being dissatisfied with the attitudes of the Government, tendered his resignation on January 22. "In the light of the opposition on the part of the Army

5

7 8

6

9

10

11

13

14 15

16

17

19

18

20 21

22

24 25 Premier HIROTA judged it difficult to maintain the Cabinet any longer, and the Cabinet resigned en masse on the following day. The date and the reasons for the resignation of the War Minister, accordingly, were different from those of the other cabinet members."

Please cross-examine.

THE PRESIDENT: Mr. Comyns Carr.

MR. COMYNS CARR: If it please the Tribunal, I do not desire to cross-examine on the matter on which I am concerned, namely, paragraph 2 of this affidavit, but I ask that if Brigadier Nolan should desire to cross-examine on the old affidavit, dealing with the question of the change in regulations, he be permitted to deal also with paragraph 1 of this new affidavit, which deals with the same matter.

MR. HANAI: The defense has no objection to the prosecution's proposal.

THE PRESIDENT: Well, the witness is released on the usual terms. He understands he is liable to be recalled for cross-examination when Brigadier Nolan is available.

(Whereupon, the witness was excused.)

MR. YAMAOKA: May it please the Tribunal, we respectfully invite the attention of the Tribunal to

exhibit 2507, which has already be read into evidence at record 20,967, in order to call attention to the fact that Foreign Minister ARITA, who succeeded Mr. HIROTA as Foreign Minister, stated he would adhere to and follow the three principles announced by Mr. HIROTA, as a basis for reaching an understanding with China. I might add that at that time Mr. HIROTA was Prime Minister.

We offer in evidence another excerpt from the Diary of Ambassador Grew, dated November 30, 1936, being defense document 206-C(3), reporting a conversation with Prime Minister HIROTA.

THE PRESIDENT: Mr. Brown.

MR. BROWN: Your Honor, the prosecution objects to this document. I should inform the Tribunal, perhaps, that this is not the first time this document has been offered in evidence. It was previously offered at page 23,181 of the record. Objection was then taken by the prosecution on the ground that it had no probative value, and by a majority the Court upheld the objection and rejected the document.

MR. YAMAOKA: If the Tribunal please, we were not aware of the fact that this had been previously offered and rejected. On the other hand, notwithstanding, we are of the opinion that this document is relevant to HIROTA's individual case and I respectfully invite the attention of the Tribunal to paragraph 2, particularly

Moreover, it reports an actual conversation between Ambassador Grew and the Prime Minister and shows that even on November 30, 1936 he was still consistent in maintaining his views concerning the Three HIROTA Principles.

THE PRESIDENT: By a majority the objection is sustained and the document rejected.

MR. YAMAOKA: We offer in evidence defense document 2159. This is an answer made by Mr. HIROTA in the proceedings of the House of Representatives at the 70th session of the Imperial Diet on January 22, 1937.

THE PRESIDENT: Mr. Brown.

MR. BROWN: Your Honor, the prosecution objects to this document as irrelevant. It merely states that the Japanese Government is not discharging its duties in accordance with Fascist theories, but in the light of public opinion. It is suggested that this is of no help to the Tribunal.

THE PRESIDENT: We better hear you Mr. Yamaoka.

Have you anything to say?

MR. YAMAOKA: If the Tribunal please, in our sub ission, this document meets the issues raised by the prosecution that Japan was conducted along, that is, the country was conducted along totalitarian lines in furtherance of the conspiracy charged in the Indictment.

THE PRESIDENT: As such it is an attempt to sway the issue. I realize relevant issues are the counts and not the particulars supported.

MR. YAMAOKA: Furthermore, the prosecution has also charged that the relationship between Japan and Germany was one in furtherance of a conspiracy to dominate the world. In our submission, this document does disclose that that relationship was not carried out to the extent contended by the prosecution. It was, furthermore, a contemporary document and shows Mr. HIROTA's views on this subject.

THE PRESIDENT: By a majority the objection is sustained and the document rejected.

MR. YAMAOKA: If the Tribunal please, Mr. HANAI will present the next witness.

THE PRESIDENT: Mr. HANAI.

MR. HANAI: May the witness INO, Hiroya be called.

HIROYA INO, called as a witness on behalf of the defense, being first duly sworn, testified through Japanese interpreters as follows:

# DIRECT EXAMINATION

#### BY : . HANAI:

Q State your name and address.

A My name is INO, Hiroya. My address, 2288, Kami-Meguro 4-Chome, Meguro-ku, Tokyo.

MR. HANAI: May the witness be shown defense document 2596.

(Whereupon, a document was handed to the witness.)

- Q Is that your affidavit bearing your signature?
- A Yes, it is.
- Q Are the contents thereof true and correct?
- A Yes, as you say.

MR. HANAI: I now tender defense document 2596 in evidence.

THE PRESIDENT: Mr. Comyns Carr.

MR. COMYNS CARR: May it please the Tribunal, the prosecution objects to the whole of paragraph 2 except the first sentence. In our submission, it is entirely irrelevant whether this gentleman did or did not see a number of documents, as to the most important of which we have direct evidence that HIROTA did see it.

0

9

6

4

10

12

13

14

15

17

18

20

21

23

12

13

14

16

17

18

19 20

21

22 23

24

25

We also object to paragraph 3 as irrelevant. 2 The witness there purports to speak of something which he says he doesn't know.

MR. HANAI: The witness is the one person who 5 knows best whether HIROTA did or did not actually see these documents. All the documents mentioned in paragraph 2 have been used by the prosecution to support their charge that HIROTA was -- to support their charges against HIROTA. If HIROTA, as President of the Bureau of Planning actually did see these documents, this witness is the one person who is qualified to tell us so.

THE PRESIDENT: This only proves that as President of that Board HIROTA didn't learn or see or do anything in connection with these documents.

MR. HANAI: All these points could be cleared up through cross-examination of the witness.

THE PRESIDENT: The objection is sustained and the document rejected so far as objected to.

CLERK OF THE COURT: Defense document 2596 will receive exhibit No. 3259.

(Whereupon, the document above referred to was marked defense exhibit No. 3259 and received in evidence.)

MR. HANAI: I shall read exhibit 3259:

5

7

10

11

12

13

14

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

"(1) I was in the office of Vice-President
of the Bureau of Planning (Kikaku-cho), under President
HIROTA, Koki, from June 10, 1937, till August 30 of
the same year. The Bureau was abolished on October 25
that year, shortly after my resignation from the above-
mentioned office. With that, Mr. HIROTA also retired
from his office of President.
"(2) The chief business of the Bureau of
Planning, while I was Vice-President there, was the
preparation for the establishment of the Insurance and
Sanitation Ministry, which was afterwards realized as
Kosei-Sho."
THE PRESIDENT: That shouldn't go in. He doe
annear to know what was objected to.

He doesn't

MR. HANAI: I withdraw the portion that I have just read.

THE PRESIDENT: The first sentence, I think, is admitted but not the balance of paragraph 2.

MR. HANAI: I shall read paragraph 3 --Correction: I shall read paragraph 4.

"(4) President HIROTA attended the office once a week or so, and the whole business in general was given in my charge. Mr. HIROTA as President charged himself with the political negotiations with those Cabinet members who had an objection to the draft plan of the

Bureau of Planning concerning the constitution and competency of the Insurance and Sanitation Ministry, among whom was Mr. NAGAI, Ryutaro, the then Communications Minister, and with the signing of the documents in connection with the business of the Bureau of Planning at the Cabinet Conference."

.THE PRESIDENT: Mr. Comyns Carr.

MR. COMYNS CARR: Only one question.

MR. HANAI: Was the latter half of paragraph 2 admitted, may I ask?

THE PRESIDENT: That was the part that was objected to. You have omitted nothing material, as far as we can judge.

MR. COMYNS CARR: Only one question.
CROSS-EXAMINATION

### BY MR. COMYNS CARR:

Q When HIROTA was appointed President of the Bureau of Planning on the 10th of June 1937, was he not also appointed Vice-Premier?

A No, that is not so.

Q In addition to his office of Foreign Minister.

A My recollection is that all he was, was Foreign Minister.

THE PRESIDENT: We will adjourn until halfpast one.

3

6

7

8

10

11

13

14 15

16

17 18

19

20

21

22

25 24

(Whereupon, at 1200, a recess was taken.)

G

10.

## AFTERNOON SESSION

3

K

n

a

p p

હ

K

a p

е

a

4

5 6

7

8 9

10

12

11

13 14

16 17

15

18 19

> 20 21

22

25

Tribunal for the Far East is now resumed. THE PRESIDENT: Mr. Yamaoka. MR. YAMAOKA: If the Tribunal please, my asso-

The Tribunal met, pursuant to recess, at 1330.

MARSHAL OF THE COURT: The International Military

ciate, Mr. HANAI, is handling this witness.

THE PRESIDENT: Mr. HANAI.

MR. HANAI: I should like to conduct a brief cross-examination.

# REDIRECT EXAMINATION

BY MR. HANAI:

"as there ever an occasion when a document went direct to the president of the Bureau of Planning without first passing through your office, that of the vice-president, in relation to documents and plans such as the 5-Year Plan?

MR. COMYNS CARR: I object to that question. does not arise out of cross-examination. The only matter on which I cross-examined was whether HIROTA was appointed vice-premier at the same time that he was appointed presi-24 dent of the Planning Bureau.

MR. HANAI: I should like to get the Court's permission to put my question.

THE PRESIDENT: We give permission only in important matters. This is of no importance. He could only speak for himself, anyhow. It does not prove anything. The permission is refused.

MR. HANAI: I should like to get the Court's permission for another question. That is, I wish to ask the witness whether he knows secretary AKIYAMA or not.

THE PRESIDENT: That is not important. You don't get that permission as a matter of course. Permission is refused.

PR. HANAI: I conclude my cross-examination.

THE PRESIDENT: Do you want the witness any further?

MR. HANAI: I should like to have the witness excused if there is no cross-examination.

THE PRESIDENT: He is excused on the usual terms.

(Whereupon, the witness was excused.)

MR. YAMAOKA: May it please the Tribunal, we offer in evidence defense document 2067. This document is an excerpt from the "Minutes of the Subcommittee of the Heads of Delegations on Pacific and Far Eastern Questions (Washington Conference 1921 - 22)." The document is offered to show the meaning and construction placed upon Article 7 of the Nine-Power Pact by the delegates who framed the Pact.

THE PRESIDENT: Mr. Brown.

MR. BROWN: Your Honor, the prosecution objects to this document, which, in our submission, in no way clarifies the meaning of Article 7. It is a discussion of a sub-committee in Washington in 1921 and 1922. As to the meaning of it, whatever conclusion the committee might or might not have reached would, in our submission, be irrelevant, as the document speaks for itself.

THE PRESIDENT: Shouldn't this have been tendered in the general phase, in any case?

MR. BROWN: That is exactly what I was going to say next, your Honor. And lastly, it is quite clear that the chairman, even had he had the power to do so, did not purport to give a final decision as to the meaning of this article. Whether he had authority to give a ruling as to its meaning we do not know, but he says, in the first place, he "supposed that it meant ..." On the next page he says he "believed they would..." Over the page the chairman thought the article meant a little more.

It is suggested that this document has no probative value.

THE PRESIDENT: "hat is the purpose of tendering this document, Mr. Yamaoka?

MR. YAMAOKA: If the Tribunal please, we are tendering this document since it has an important bearing

1 2

. 4

upon Japan's position in refusing the invitation to the Brussels Conference, a point upon which the prosecution relies in support of their case; and I may add I believe later proof by other witnesses will show that the HIROTA Government did rely upon this extract.

Now, specifically as to the relevancy of a document of this nature, it would seem to me that it is not
unusual to introduce into evidence hearings before committees, of legislation pending before, let us say, a
legislature, in order that the proper interpretation can
be given to the terms of a piece of legislation or, let
us say, a treaty; and whereas here Japan relied upon this
proof in order to refuse the invitation to the conference,
it would seem, in our submission, to have very definite
probative value and relevancy.

It further goes to the point of whether or not there was a violation by Japan in refusing to attend that conference.

As to the further point, if your Honors please,
as to whether or not this was a matter that should have
been presented in the general phase. I wish to state in
the individual case of the accused HIROTA, since he was one
of the principal dramatis personae, the fact that evidence
on his behalf may be intertwined with matters pertaining
to the general phases is something which is inherent in

the case.

THE PRESIDENT: By a majority the Court sustains the objection and rejects the document.

IR. YAMAOKA: If the Tribunal please, I should like to deviate here from my order of proof and I should like to call for document No. 56 on our order of proof instead of 54 at this moment, and I request that the witness HOPINOUCHI, Kensuke be called.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

KENSUKE HORINOUCHI, called as a witness on behalf of the defense, being first duly sworn, testified through Japanese interpreters as follows:

#### DIRECT EXAMINATION

### BY MR. YAMAOKA:

Q Will the witness kindly state his name and address?

A My name is HORINOUCHI, Kensuke. My address is 871 Shimo-Meguro 4-chome, Meguro-ku, Tokyo.

MR. YAMAOKA: May the witness be shown defense document 2147?

(Whereupon, a document was handed to the witness.)

- Q Is that your affidavit?
- A Yes.
- Q Is it, in all respects, true and correct?
- A I wish to make two corrections.
- Q Will you kindly state them?
- A The first correction -- in the second paragraph on page 3, towards the middle, "Director MACHIJIRI of the Bureau of Military Affairs" should be changed to "Director MACHIJIRI of the Military Administration Section." That is correction No. 1.

On page 5, the second paragraph of the numbered paragraph 8, I should like to have the last sentence of that paragraph taken out, namely, "Britain also took a similar measure, as I remember, shortly after that."

This has nothing to do with the Japanese text because the Japanese text has already been corrected -- is correct.

MR. YAMAOKA: If the Tribunal please, I offer in evidence defense document 2147, as corrected by the witness.

THE PRESIDENT: Mr. Comyns Carr.

MR. COMYNS CARR: If the Tribunal please, the prosecution objects to the whole of this affidevit on various grounds:

portion of peragraph 6 on page 4 on the ground on which I successfully objected to a large number of paragraphs yesterday, in the affidavit of KUWASHIMA, namely, that it is all concerned with matters, acts, opinions and statements of ARITA, from whom an affidavit has been served upon us in this section, and who therefore is the proper person to deal with these matters. Assuming them to be relevant in HIROTA's case at all, he is not mentioned during the whole of

7 8

that portion of the affidavit.

A subsidiary objection is that the affidavit contains references to and relies upon documents which have already been rejected by this Tribunal as irrelevant, namely, in the last paragraph but one of paragraph 4 on page 3, defense document 1423, which was rejected although I see it is proposed to tender it again.

At the top of page 4, reliance is placed upon a number of documents relating to the Communist International which were rejected by this Tribunal. In addition, there is a great deal of opinion, chiefly what is said to be ARITA's opinion but sometimes the itness', particularly in paragraph 5, but scattered throughout the document.

With regard to the last part of paragraph 6, and the whole of paragraph 7, it relates to attempts to induce Great Britain and the Netherlands to join in the Anti-Comintern Pact, a subject which is, in my submission, irrelevant as the Tribunal ruled when they rejected defense document 1424, at page 22,504 of the record.

I should have said that the documents as to the Communist International are not even being tendered again; they are simply treated as though they were

3

1

6

8

9

10

11

12 13

14

15 16

17

18 19

20

21 22

23

in evidence when they are not.

Paragraphs 8 to the end relate to the attitude of the HIROTA Cabinet and the HAYASHI Cabinet, which latter is irrelevant in this phase, in any event, to the proposed inclusion of Italy in the Anti-Comintern Pact. In the part relating to the HIROTA C inet the witness is obviously speaking on matters to which either HIROTA or ARITA could much more properly direct the attention of the Tribunal, and it is full of the witness' opinions as to what was the attitude of the Cabinet.

Finally, on page 6 there is a great deal of the witness' opinion as to the unpopularity of Japan with the other nations of the world, particularly in 1937, and the causes thereof. And finally it comes to the only matter which is possibly relevant, namely, the circumstances under which Italy was admitted into the anti-Comintern Pact, but the description of that is so full of opinion as to be extremely difficult to sever it from fact.

THE PRESIDENT: Page 7, is it not?

MR. COMYNS CARR: Page 7. I mean paragraphs

9 and 10 on page 7 merely make assertions which the
witness is obviously not qualified to make as to

whether HIROTA was concerned in the conclusion of the Japanese-German-Italian Tripartite Pact, a matter which took place entirely after the witness, according to his own account, had ceased to hold any office whatever.

I should not have included paragraph 10 in that statement. That merely states that a certain committee was not appointed and is, in my submission, an irrelevant circumstance.

Greenberg & Birton

. 25

THE PRESIDENT: Mr. Yamaoka.

MR. YAMAOKA: May it please the Tribunal, in reply I desire to point out that the present witness was "ice-Minister for Foreign Affairs in the HIROTA Cabinet during the periods matters testified to here occurred; and in that official position it is not unnatural to suppose that he was well aware of the matters to which he testifies here.

Minister ARITA should be the proper party to testify, so long as matters are within the knowledge of this witness I am unaware of any rule requiring that we should be obliged to call Mr. ARITA. If there is any question, I respectfully submit, as to the credibility of this witness, why, then the matter could be properly elicited on cross-examination. Moreover, the Tribunal will recall that the Anti-Comintern Pact, together with the secret agreement annexed, was introduced as prosecution exhibit No. 36, I believe, and is an important item in the chain of the prosecution's case.

Specifically as to some of these paragraphs,

No. 1 to which my learned friend objected -- I be
lieve he did object to No. 1 -- I don't think is a

proper objection.

-

IMR. COMYN: CARR: I did include No. 1, but that would go, of course, if the rest goes. It is merely the witness' career. If any part of the affidavit remains, then No. 1 would remain.

MR. YAMAOKA: Paragraphs 2 and 3 down to and including 6 describes the activities of the Foreign Office concerning the conclusion of the Anti-Comintern Pact by a party who was in his official position attracted with these matters.

I desire further to point out that in paragraph 3 the telegraphic instruction which is mentioned is already an exhibit in the case, exhibit 2614. Also, in this paragraph, it mentions that the Foreign Minister did reveal his views to the Prime Minister HIROTA.

As to paragraph 4, the matters to which the witness testifies, that is, the documents in support of the matters to which he testifies, are shown to have been lost by fire and the originals cannot be found.

Also on page 3 of the affidavit, still dealing with paragraph No. 4, my learned friend mentioned define document 1423 as having been previously rejected. As to that he is quite correct. But,
upon reading the record, if I am not mistaken, I

8

9 10

11

12

13 14

15

16 17

18

19

20 21

22

23 24

believe it was rejected because there was not sufficient certification as to the source of this document when it was first presented. Now that it is identified by this witness as being a proper Foreign Office document, we are tendering it subsequently on the ord r of proof.

As to paragraph 6, page 4, I respectfully invite the attention of the Tribunal to the fact that the document mentioned at the very end of paragraph No. 6 is defense document 1425.

As to paragraph No. 7, the last paragraph of this -- this numbered paragraph which appears on page 5 of the English copy, the Tribunal will note that documents are mentioned, and these documents will be tendered later, being numbered 61 on our order of proof, defense document 1424.

I understand that this was previously rejected, that is, this last document, but we are resubmitting it later on our order of proof; and I think at the present time, if the testimony of this witness is accepted, that lays a sufficient foundation for the submission of this document even though it was previously rejected.

With reference to the HAYASHI Cabinet. which was after Mr. HIROTA was in office, I desire

,

to state that, as the Tribunal no doubt is well aware, the HAYASHI Cabinet existed for only a few months following the HIROTA Cabinet; and thereafter, when the first KONOYE Cabinet was formed, Mr. HIROTA again became Foreign Minister.

As to paragraph 9 and 10, as to the question whether or not the matters are proper, to which this witness can testify since he was not in service as Vice-Foreign Minister, I desire to state that he still was in the employ of the Foreign Office. If I am not mistaken, that will be disclosed by paragraph No. 1 of the affidavit.

With respect to the Communist Internationale, if I am not mistaken, I believe the Tribunal ruled that if, at any time in the individual cases, it could be shown that the individual accused relied upon the matters which we then presented during that phase of the case earlier this year, then the evidence concerning those matters could be introduced in the individual phase.

As to the further question, if your Honors please, as to whether or not the activities by Japan to conclude similar pacts with the other nations, that is to say, other than the Axis Powers, is relevant or not, in our submission we think it is rele-

vant in order to meet the issue raised by the prosecution. As I understand that issue it is that Japan, together with the Axis nations, conspired to dominate not only East Asia but the world by means, among others, of, specifically, the Anti-Comintern Pact and other proof which is already in the case. And I respectfully submit that, if proof is tendered to show that similar pacts were tendered to countries other than the Axis, that is clearly relevant to rebut the prosecution's evidence as well as to show that there was no such intention on the part of Japan at all.

For all these reasons I respectfully submit that the document should be admitted.

THE PRESIDENT: By a majority the objection is sustained and the document rejected.

MR. YAMAOKA: In the light of the Tribunal's ruling may I request a direction? If, in the Tribunal's opinion, Mr. ARITA is the proper witness concerning these matters, we should like to present this evidence through him.

THE PRESIDENT: We will receive any relevant and material evidence from ARITA. I cannot undertake to tell you how far each Member of the Tribunal is influenced by the objections. All I can say is that

2

4 5

6

8

9

11

12 13

14 15

16 17

18

20 21

19

22

23

24

a majority sustain them.

MR. YAMAOKA: If your Honors please, we are confronted with this problem: Mr. ARITA probably will be called within the next day or two; and, under the rules of the Tribunal, we should have an affidavit prepared and served at least on the Members of the Tribunal three days in advance.

THE FRESIDENT: We will consider your application for some enlightenment on this point, Mr. Yamaoka. At present I cannot give you any information.

MR. YAMAOKA: Well, then I shall make the application at the time we call the witness ARITA.

I ask that defense document 2146 be handed the witness.

(Whereupon, a document was handed to the witness.)

BY MR. YAMAOYA (Continued):

- Q Is that your affidavit?
- · A Yes.
  - O Is it in all respects true and correct?
- A It is true and correct with the exception of three corrections.
  - Q Will you point those corrections out?
  - A On page 1 of the English text, in the middle

3

3

6

/

9

10 11

12

13 14

15 16

17

18

19 20

21

23

24

of the numbered paragraph 2, "Marquis KIDO, who was the Chief Secretary to the Lord Keeper of the Privy seal" should be corrected to "Marquis KIDO who was the President of the Bureau of Peers."

The second correction concerns a typographical error in the Japanese original and has no relation to the English text.

The third correction is on page 4 of the English text, line 11 of paragraph numbered 12.

"The interview took place on the 8th" should be corrected to "The interview took place on the 10th."

Q Is that all?

A Yes, that is all.

MR. YAMAOKA: If the Tribunal please, I note on paragraph No. 1 on page 1 of this document the last line, "May 26, 1936" is obviously an error and should be "1938."

THE PRESIDENT: 1933?

MR. YAMAOKA: 1938. And I have also noted another error in the English copy, page 4, paragraph numbered 10, third line from the bottom of that paragraph. It says "the agreement of August 11." I understand that this should be "agreement of July 11."

I now offer in evidence defense document

2146 as corrected.

THE PRESIDENT: Mr. Comyns Carr.

-

MR. COMYNS CARR: May it please the Tribunal, the prosecution objects to certain parts of this affidavit only.

Paragraph 2, on the ground that it is irrelevant. It describes circumstances under which HIROTA became Foreign Minister in the First KONOYE Cabinet and various people who recommended him for that post. In my submission that is merely an attempt to get in character evidence by a side wind and is, for any other purpose, irrelevant.

Paragraph 3 is objected to on the ground that it is partly repetition of evidence given by other wiresses and partly a summary of his previous affidavit which has just been rejected.

In paragraph 15 on page 5 there are two sentences to which we object. One is in the middle of the first subparagraph about the opinion of the people of Japan and the other is from the second sentence in the second paragraph beginning with, "But the public opinion of Japan," down to the middle of the first line on page 6. In our submission neither the witness nor anybody else is entitled to tell us what was the opinion of a mixed body of people, nor would it be relevant if they could.

There is a similar sentence, two sentences,

7 8

to which we object in paragraph 18 on the middle of page 7, beginning in the middle of subparagraph 2-not the numbered one, the second subparagraph,
"Drastic opinions," down to "by such circumstances";
and we object to the last sentence in paragraph 20
about something which General UGAKI tells somebody

MR. YAMAOKA: If the Tribunal please-THE PRESIDENT: Mr. Yamaoka.

else to do as being irrelevant to the case of HIROTA.

MR. YAMAOKA: With respect to paragraph numbered 2, we believe that this is relevant and material in showing how Mr. HIROTA came to assume the office of Foreign Minister in the KONOYE Cabinet. We do not believe that this is character evidence and if at all it will show that Mr. HIROTA was not part of any conspiracy in joining the KONOYE Cabinet. We think that the circumstances surrounding his assumption of office as set forth here will be helpful to the Tribunal in understanding the accused's case.

As to paragraph numbered 3, while it is true that the subject matter has been previously testified to in the case, this witness was in an official position to know about these negotiations and it was included very briefly for the purpose of telling a rounded out story.

4 5

22 23

.

3

5

7

8

9

10

12 13

14 15

16 17

18

20

21

23 24

25

As to the objections to paragraph numbered 15, the sentences relative to Japanese public opinion, although the word opinion is used, this, I do not believe, is a statement of opinion by the witness.

THE PRESIDENT: That is not the objection.

The objection is that it is too much for any one man to say and it certainly does not involve an opinion on the proof the person expressing the opinion.

However, if public opinion could be relevant, I do not know how else you could establish it.

MR. YAMAOKA: I was going to add, if your Honor please, that this public opinion is naturally a matter of vital concern to men in public office because they rely upon it and act upon it, while admittedly it may be difficult of ascertaining.

As to the objection in paragraph 18, I believe that my point just discussed covers this matter.

I believe that covers the principal points of the objections.

THE PRESIDENT: By a majority the Court sustains the objections and admits the document to the extent not objected to, on the usual terms.

CLERK OF THE COURT: Defense document 2146 will receive exhibit No. 3260.

(Whereupon, the document above referred to was marked defense exhibit No. 3260 and received in evidence.

MR. YAMAOKA: I shall read exhibit 3260 to the extent admitted, omitting the formal part:

"(1) I received an appointment as a diplomatic attache on December 2, 1911, and remained in the diplomatic service until I retired on December 21, 1940. During that period I was appointed Vice-Minister for Foreign Affairs under Mr. Hachiro ARITA, the Foreign Minister of the HIROTA Cabinet, on April 10, 1936, and remained in the office until I was appointed Ambassador to the United States on October 15, 1938.

Of the same period, I was under Foreign Minister HIROTA in the First KONOYE Cabinet from June 4, 1937 to May 26, 1938."

\* \* \*

"(4) The Foreign Office did not have the slightest inkling of this incident. The official telegram reporting its outbreak reached Tokyo on July 8, 1937, the following day. Foreign Minister HIROTA was at his villa at Kugenuma and had already been in bed when he received a telephone call from the Foreign Office, reporting the outbreak of the incident.

"The Foreign Office's policy was to make its utmost effort in seeking an amicable settlement of the matter as soon as possible. An extraordinary meeting

7 8

9

10 11

12 13

14 15

16 17

18

19 20

21

22

23 24 of the Cabinet council was held on July 9, and decided the attitude of the Government to hold fast to the policy to arrest the spread of the disturbance and to seek a prompt, local settlement of the matter. This decision was made largely due to the opinion of Foreign Minister HIROTA.

- "(5) Meanwhile, in North China, Major-General Gun HASHIMOTO, the then Chief of the Staff of North China Stationary Force, and others negotiated with the Chinese 29th Army, reaching an agreement at 8:00 P.M. on the 11th. The Chinese 29th Army accepted the following demands of the Japanese Army.
- The representative of the 29th Army "(I) should express their regret, punish the responsible, and make a vow that recurrence of such event should be prevented.
- "(II) As the concentration of Chinese troops near Fengtai where Japanese forces are stationed is liable to cause untoward incidents, the Chinese troops stationed at the citadel of the Marco Polo Bridge and Lungwangmiao should be withdrawn, and police forces should take their places.
- "(III) Anti-Japanese organizations should be kept under strict control.

"These terms seemed to be carried by the

for prudence and caution.

"But, in the meantime, there occurred frequertly skirmishes between the Japanese and the Chinese troops, as the latter, once withdrawn, reappeared in the areas in question, and the situation called

THE PRESIDENT: We will recess for fifteen minutes.

(Whereupon, at 1445, a recess was taken until 1500, after which the proceedings were resumed as follows:)

Duda & Sprutt

1

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

MARSHAL OF THE COURT: The International Military Tribunal for the Far East is now resumed.

THE PRESIDENT: Mr. Yamaoka.

MR. YAMAOKA: May it please the Tribunal, I will continue reading this exhibit.

"(6) Prior to this, it was arranged that an extraordinary session of the Cabinet council was to be held on July 11, and it was reported that the army would propose preliminary measures for mobilization. The Foreign Minister was again at his villa at Kugenuma from the evening of July 9. The programme was immediately reported to him by telephone, and on the morning of July 11 he arrived at Shimbashi Station around 9 o'clock. As soon as he reached the Foreign Office he assembled myself, East Asiatic Director ISHII and European-Asiatic Director TOGO in his office to deliberate upon the reported army's proposal, and it was decided that the proposition should be opposed. The Foreign Minister soon attended the Cabinet meeting, and the following results were reported afterward.

"First, War Minister SUGIYAMA explained
the plan for the preliminary arrangements for
mobilization. It was made clear by this explanation
that the plan was not to make immediately arrangements

24

for mobilization. It might have more properly been said just preparing for the preliminary arrangements of mobilization. It amounted to the decision of the Cabinet to envisage eventual preparatory measures for mobilization in case the situation assumes more serious proportions. The Foreign Minister suggested, however, that the matter might have already been settled locally by that time, and took the position that the consideration of the army proposal in question should be postponed until further reports reached the government.

"Thus the discussion was once postponed.

But, the awaited report being so late in coming,
the cabinet council was assembled again on the same
day and was compelled to approve the army proposal
which provided that, in order to secure the apology
and future guarantee by the Chinese, necessary forces
in the homeland should also be mobilized while contingents from the Kwantung Army and the Chosen Army
were to be dispatched to reinforce the North China
Stationary Force, and that all possible efforts
should be made for a peaceful settlement of the
incident in conformity with the policy of local
settlement, and also that the dispatch of the troops
should immediately be stopped when the above-

S

mentioned object was attained and the apology and future guarantee were fulfilled by the Chinese.

"Foreign Minister HIROTA consented to this decision with reservations that the dispatch of troops, even when it was carried into execution, should be exclusively for the purpose of protecting the Japanese residents and securing the safety of the North China Stationary Force itself which was comparatively small in strength, and that the decision for the mobilization of home troops was nothing more than an attitude of preparedness as contended by the War Minister.

"(7) Holding fast to the policy of speedy local settlement of the incident, the Foreign Office was determined to spare no effort for its attainment. By the Foreign Minister's order, I asked Mr. Yang Yun-chu, the Chinese Charge d'Affaires to call at the Foreign Office on the morning of July 11, and called the attention of the Chinese Government to the critical situation in North China, urging the necessity of a quick local settlement. I also told him that instructions to the same effect had been given early in that morning to the Japanese Ambassador to China.

"(8) Mr. KAWAGOYE, the Japanese Ambassador

1 2

3 4

2

3

5

6

7

0

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

to China, was on his journey to North China, at that time, leaving Shanghai on the very day of the outbreak of the incident, and Councilor HIROTA executed the instructions on his behalf. Meanwhile, we successfully received authoritative reports that the Nanking Government, in spite of our representations made at Nanking as well as at Tokyo, were dispatching reinforcements, troop after troop, to North China. The Chinese 29th Army also, probably influenced by such military actions of the Nanking Government, became to show a dubious attitude in connection with the execution of the three terms of settlement agreed upon on July 11. The Foreign Office, thereupon, ordered Councilor HIROTA by wire on July 16 to call upon the Nanking Government not to interfere with the execution of the three terms, and to check the northward movement of the Chinese central armies. Nevertheless, the central armies were reported still advancing northward as before.

"(9) In view of such attitude on the part of China, the cabinet decided at its meeting of July 20 that, in order to meet emergency, preparations should be made for the mobilization of three home divisions.

"The Foreign Office, however, did not give up the hope of amicable settlement, and had Councilor HIDAKA pursue in earnest the negotiation in Nanking. Unfortunately, there again occurred armed clashes between the Japanese and Chinese forces in North China since July 25 or 26. The situation thus making serious developments, the orders for the mobilization of three home divisions were at last issued on July 27. From the early morning of the following 28th onwards, the hostilities in North China went on spreading. Moreover, Shanghai and its vicinity, where the situation had been comparatively tranquil, turned disquieting. Thus all the efforts of Councilor HIDAKA in Nanking proved fruitless.

"(10) In Tokyo, Mr. Dodds, the British
Charge d'Affaires, called on me on July 15, and
asked if Britain could be of any service in settling
the incident. I told him in reply that I thought
there were prospects of local settlement. From that
day on till about July 20, Mr. Dodds came to see me
almost every day and kept me informed of the gist
of the conversations between Ambassador Huggessen
and the Chinese Foreign Minister. On these occasions, I always told him that we had not yet given

up our hope to settle the incident locally. On
the 22nd, American Ambassador Grew made an offer
to Foreign Minister HIROTA that his government
would render its services, if necessary, in the
way short of mediation. But the Foreign Minister
replied that, in the light of the actual situation
of North China about the 19th, there was still some
hope that the agreement of August 11 might be
carried into execution. Actually the Japanese
Foreign Office had not given up the hope of local
settlement then, and was making desperate efforts.

"(11) It was in July that a draft of terms of settlement with China was worked out as a result of the deliberation among the competent authorities of the Foreign Office, the War Office, and the Ministry of the Navy. It consisted of three main points: (A) the establishment of unfortified zones along the River Pai-ho, and the withdrawal of Japanese and Chinese troops from the areas specified as such; (B) no annexation of territories; and (C) no indemnities. The draft was approved on August 5 by the Foreign Minister, the War Minister, the Minister of the Navy and the Premier.

"(12) Early in August, Foreign Minister

HIROTA made up his mind to dispatch Mr. Tatsuichiro FUNATSU, an authority on China, to Shanghai, in an attempt at restoring peace between Japan and China. Mr. FUNATSU's mission was to have talks, on the lines of the said peace terms decided upon in August, with Mr. Kao Tsung-wu, the Chief of the Asiatic Bureau of the Chinese Foreign Office, who had a direct contact with Generalissimo Chiang Kaishek. Mr. FUNATSU left Tokyo about August 5. arriving at Shanghai on the 7th. Ambassador KAWAGOYE, on the other hand, returned to his post in Shanghai almost at the same time. And, on deliberation between the two, it was decided that Ambassador KAWAGOYE in person would negotiate with Mr. Kao Tsung-wu. The interview took place on the 8th. As the Ambassador revealed the three terms of the August plan as his personal propositions, Mr. Kao stated that he thought there were prospects of peaceful settlement between Japan and China upon these terms, and promised that he would promptly return to Nanking to make a report to Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek, and then again see Ambassador KAWAGOYE in Shanghai. But, it happened that a Japanese naval officer was killed by Chinese soldiers on August 9 (the so-called OYAMA incident),

3

6

8

9

10

11

13 14

15

16 17

18

19

20 21

22

23 24

25

and from the 13th on, both Japanese and Chinese forces entering into hostilities even in Shanghai district, the communication was utterly suspended between Nanking and Shanghai. The KAWAGOYE-Kao interview ended, in this way, without tangible results.

"(13) Even after that, Foreign Minister did not give up his hope to find a clue of HIRC an amicable settlement of the incident. He asked Mr. ARITA, who had been Foreign Minister in the HIROTA Cabinet, to go to Shanghai where the leading figures of the Nanking Government gathered often, and stay there for some time to seize a chance of having informal talks with them. Mr. ARITA accepted it, and, on deliberation between the two, it was so arranged that he would first visit Manchuria and North China, staying there until the Foreign Minister wired him and let him know the proper time to start for Shanghai. Mr. ARITA left Tokyo on August 28 on his tour of inspection in Manchuria, Peking, Tientsin and other places, but, as the sit ion did not take a favorable turn for his visit to Shanghai as expected, he was compelled to leave Dairen for Tokyo at the end of September.

"(14) It was in September after the

11 12

13

14

15

10

16 17 18

21 22

19

20

23 24

25

KAWAGOYE-Kao conversation proved failure that the competent chiefs of bureaus of the Foreign Office, the War Office, and the Ministry of the Navy assembled to talk over how to deal with the peace problem thereafter, reaching an agreement that, if the endeavor after peace was to be continued at all, there was no other way for it but to ask for the good offices of a third power to find settlement with China on the terms of the August plan. This opinion was presented to the government, and was approved by the Premier, the Foreign Minister, the War Minister, and the Minister of the Navy.

"Almost at the same time as the above, the chiefs of the bureaus concerned assembled, by the orders of the ministers concerned, to discuss the policy which the government was to adopt in connection with the various problems of the China Affair. They, however, could not attain agreement on two or three points. Thereupon, I conferred with the Vice-Ministers of War and of the Navy, and settled the points. This was decided as the policy of the government on October 1, with the pproval of the Premier, the Foreign Minister, the War Minister, and the Minister of the Navy. The point which demands our special attention is that this 'Shina-Jihen Taisho Yoko' (The Gist of the Policy for

the Settlement of the China Affair) stipulated (a) to bring the China Affair to the quickest possible conclusion, (b) to act strictly in conformity with the international law, (c) to limit the scene of battle chiefly thin the provinces of Hopei and Chahar as well as Shanghai district, and (d) to strive for the settlement of the North China question along the lines of policy that the said area should be placed under the administration of the Chinese Central Government.

"(15) On September 21, the League of Nations requested the Japanese Government to participate in the Twenty-Three Power Consultative Committee. Japan, however, had seceded from the League on March 27, 1933. Since then, it had maintained a firm attitude not to participate in any political activity of the League of Nations. . . The Japanese Government, thereupon, made a reply on September 25 to the effect that it could not accept the said request of the League of Nations.

Belgian Government invited Japan to participate in the Brussels Conference which was to be held in accordance with the provisions of Article VII of the Nine-Power Pact. . . The Japanese Government was compelled to reply to the Belgian requests of October 20

and November 7, on October 27 and November 12 respectively, that it could not accept the same. With respect to Article VII of the Nine-Power Pact, the Foreign Office authorities held the following interpretation:

and November 7, on October 27 and November 12 respectively, that it could not accept the same. With respect to Article VII of the Nine-Power Pact, the Foreign Office authorities held the following interpretation:

2

3

5

6

7

3

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

"Article VII of the Nine-Power Pact runs: 'The contracting Powers agree that whenever a situation arises which in the opinion of any one of them involves the application of the stipulations of the present Treaty, and renders desirable discussion of such application, there should be full and frank communication between the contracting Powers concerned.' Either in the light of the wording of the article or in consideration of the circumstances under which the said article was referred to discussion at the first meeting of the S ocommittee for the Pacific and Far Eastern Problems of the Washington Conference (held on February 2, 1922), it is evident that 'communication' here means communication in any form, and not necessarily that in the form of conference. Moreover, the proceedings of the said subcommittee show that the communication should be made, as a general rule, through ordinary diplomatic channels, and the communication in the form of conference is not in the least expected.

"In accordance with such interpretation, the Foreign Office understood that to reject the participation in the Brussels Conference was not against the provisions of the Nine-Power Pact inasmuch as the participation was expected to be detrimental to the internal affairs of Japan.

22

23

24

"(16) Early in September, British Ambassador 1 Craigie rived at his post in Tokyo. He was such an enterprising man that he set about settling the case of Ambassador Huggessen's accident of August 26 as soon 4 as he took up his duties. He had frank talks with Vice-Admiral YAMAMOTO, the Vice-Minister of the Navy, and 6 myself, succeeding in solving the problem soon.

"On October 27, the Foreign Minister, in an individual interview with the Ambassadors of Britain, the United States, Germany and Italy, told them that the Japanese Government could not accept the invitation to the Brussels Conference, but desired to have either of the four powers use its good offices for bringing about direct peace negotiations between Japan and China upon the terms of the August plan. And, as the British Ambassador soon called upon the Foreign Minister and informed aim of his government's willingness to use its good offices for negotiations between the two countries, the Foreign Minister accepted. Between them there were several exchanges of views concerning terms of settlement. But, as it was realized afterwards that there was strong opposition within the army against Britain acting as a go-between, the scheme had to be held in abeyance.

"A similar offer was made also by American

3

3

10 11

13

14

12

15 16

17

18

19 20

21

22 23

24

2

4

5

7

9

10

11

13

15

14

16

18

19

20

21

23 24

25

Ambassador Grew almost at the same time, though on condition that both governments of Japan and China asked for it. This offer of the American Ambassador, however, cid not materialize after all.

"(17) The army maintained to ask for the good offices of the German Government. But the Foreign Minister hesitated, as he doubted if the services of the German Government alone, which did not have strong voice in China, were really effectual. In the meantime, British Ambassador Craigie made a suggestion for the joint services of Britain, the United States and Germany, for fear of the inefficacy of the efforts of the singlehanded Germany. The army's objection against the participation of Britain and the United States, however, was too obvious. The Foreign Minister, thereupon, asked Ambassador Craigie to take the initiative in requesting Germany to let the other powers participate in the attempt, for it was expected that, inasmuch as Germany herself agreed to act in concert with Britain and the United States, the army also might possibly consent to their cooperation. But, it was reported later by Ambassador Craigie that, in response to his request, he was told by the German Ambassador to the effect that, as the approach to the Chinese Government still remained in the stage of sounding, consideration would be given

later to the proposal of Britain and the United States after it attained the stage that China responded to the Japanese efforts.

"One day in December, the Foreign Minister received a personal letter from German Ambassador Dirksen saying that he had an important matter to discuss with the Foreign Minister, and that he wished to invite the Foreign Minister to tea, as he could not get out on account of illness. The Foreign Minister called upon the German Ambassador, and was told that, when Herr Trautmann, the German Ambassador to China, met Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek on December 2, the head of the Chinese Government revealed he had no objection to starting peace negotiations on the basis of the Japanese terms. And Dirksen asked the Foreign Minister if there was no alteration in the peace terms of the August plan yet.

"(18) The Foreign Minister, thereupon, had
the Director of East Asiatic Bureau confer with the
competent authorities of the War Office and the
Ministry of the Navy, and it was made clear that both
the army and the navy had no objection to the peace
terms of the August plan.

"The question, however, had to be submitted to the Liaison Conference of the government and the

--

army and the navy which had been set up a little before that, and it was placed on the agenda for the meeting of December 20. The fall of Nanking on December 13 had considerably stiffened the general feelings of the Japanese public towards China. Home Minister SUYETSUGU, for example, was supported by such general feelings. Claiming to give a smashing blow to China, he was known for his drastic attitude towards China, and was naturally against the peace negotiation itself. Unprecedentedly as Home Minister, he attended the December 20 meeting of the Liaison Conference which was held to deliberate upon the peace terms for China. He laid an extremely strong opinion before the conference, and, after a heated discussion, the conference decided upon the four fundamental terms of peace for China, which were naturally far less compromising than those of the August plan.

"The four terms were as follows:

- "1) The Chinese Government is requested to give up its pro-Comintern and anti-Japanese, anti-Manchoukuo policy, and cooperate with Japan and Manchoukuo in their anti-Comintern policy.
- "2) Unfortified zones shall be set up in needed areas, and special administrative machineries shall be established in the said areas.

12

13

11

14

15 16

17

18 19

20

21

22

24

	"3)	Close	economic relations sh	all be
reated	among	Japan,	Manchoukuo and China	

"4) The Chinese Government is requested to make necessary reparations.

"The Japanese Government expected the reply to the above to be given before January 5 or 6 of the following year.

"(19) These four terms of peace were presented to Ambassador Dirks and with a detailed explanation.

They were submitted to the Chinese Government through Ambassador Trautmann in December 26, but no reply was obtained by the appointed date.

The Foreign Office urged the reply several times through the German Government, and as late as January 13, the Chinese Foreign Minister replied to German Ambassador Trautmann to the effect that, as the Japanese peace terms covered too wide a scope, the Chinese Government wished to know their further details in order to make the final decision thereof. Ambassador Dirksen conveyed the Chinese reply to the Japanese Foreign Minister on January 14.

"As to the contents of the four fundamental terms, however, a detailed explanation had already been given through the German Government. It was quite incomprehensible to us that the Chinese Government

should make a request to know the contents of the terms to further details. In the light of the progress of the past negotiations between the two governments since the outbreak of the incident, the Japanese Government could not but regard it as an artifice to delay the settlement on purpose. The Foreign Office was greatly discouraged by this reply of the Chinese Government.

"The reply of the Chinese Foreign Minister
was brought up for discussion at the cabinet council
of January 15. The council also regarded it as an
artifice to delay intentionally the settlement of the
incident, and had to decide to close the negotiation.
The declaration 'not to deal with the Nationalist Government hereafter' was made in this way on January 16.

"(20) I should like to relate, by the way,
what I know about the circumstances which caused the
Japanese Government to use, in the manifestation of
its serious intention, such a colloquial expression as
'not to deal with the Nationalist Government hereafter,'
which is not necessarily clear in meaning. It was first
proposed to use an expression 'to discontinue the
negotiation,' at the conference of the competent
authorities of the ministries concerned. But the
Foreign Office opposed to using such a plain and definite

expression, and it was decided, after careful consideration, that the more or less vague expression as the above-mentioned should be adopted. This is a proof that the Japanese Foreign Office had the intention to leave scop; enough to resume the negotiation for peace with the Nationalist Government. In March of that year, the Italian authorities at Shanghai frequently transmitted to the Japanese Embassy there the intention of the Nationalist Government concerning the peace terms which was sounded by the Italian Councillor then at Hankao. And I remember Foreign Minister HIROTA gave a tacit consent to the Japanese Embassy in China keeping in touch with the Italian diplomatic authorities.

careful consideration to safeguarding the interests of the third powers in China. Even after the outbreak of the incident, he mentioned it several times in the announcements of the government, and actually exerted all his efforts in its favour. I can cite a striking instance of such efforts of the Foreign Minister. In April or May, 1938, he ordered me, in response to an 'fer of the British Government, to discuss with Ambassador Craigie the questions regarding the maintenance of the Chinese customs system and the modification of tariff. We met several times, and, as a

3 4

result, an agreement, satisfactory to both parties, was concluded, and made public. This agreement restrained the modification of the tariff rates, in the light of the real state of things in those days, within a certain limit so that it might not be against the interests of the third powers. It also aimed at forestalling the seizure of the Chinese customs by the Japanese Army. Ambassador Craigie had kept close contact with the Ambassadors of the United States and France before the agreement was arrived at, and the British Ambassador confidentially told me that both countries had no objection to the said agreement. In this way, Foreign Minister HIROTA exerted his efforts to keep the effects of military measures upon the interests of the third powers within the least limit, through negotiations with those third powers.

"(22) The originals as well as the copies of the telegrams referred to in the present deposition, in (7) and (8), having been lost in the fire, they are not found in the files of the Foreign Office."

At this time, if the Tribunal please, I would like to offer in evidence defense document 2536, being the deposition of HAYASHI, Kaoru, of the Foreign Office, attesting to the fact that the telegrams referred to in the affidavit of the witness HORINOUCHI, paragraphs

7 and 8, were lost by fire during the war and cannot be found in the files of the Foreign Office.

THE RESIDENT: Admitted on the usual terms.

CLERK OF THE COURT: Defense document 2536

will receive exhibit No. 3261.

(Whereupon, the document above referred to was marked defense exhibit No. 3261 and received in evidence.)

&

MR. YAMAOKA: I will not read this exhibit.

In view of the fact that the defense document 2147, the entire affidavit of this witness, having been rejected, I hereby withdraw No. 57 on our order of proof, defense document 2537.

With the permission of the Tribunal, I should like to ask about three or four questions in addition to this affidavit.

May the witness be handed defense document 2146, exhibit 3260.

(Whereupon, a document was handed

to the witness.)

## BY MR. YAMAOKA (Continued):

In paragraph 16 of your affidavit, you mention that the British Ambassador, Sir Robert Craigie, arrived in Tokyo in September, 1937. Do you know whether Foreign Minister HIROTA had conversations with the British Ambassador before October 27, 1937?

A I do remember.

Q Will the witness --

A (Continuing) Foreign Minister HIROTA made an unofficial request to British Ambassador Craigie to offer his good offices in enabling Japan and China to conduct direct negotiations between themselves. I remember that the conversations between the two in

6

7

9

10

11

12

14

15

16

17

18

13

19 20

22

23

24

4 5

3

7

6

9

8

11

13

15

16

18

19

21

23

25

Since the beginning of the incident, Mr.

HIROTA had met several times with the Chinese Ambassador, Lr. Hsu Shih-ying, and had talked with him

of September to the beginning of October.

connection with this request were held from the end

with a view to settling the matter.

MR. COMYNS CARR: One moment. Without control of my friend, the witness is wandering on to tell us a number of matters he wasn't asked. The one essential question, before any of this can be admissible, hasn't been asked or answered, namely, whether the witness was present at the conversations with Sir Robert Craigie, of which the witness is speaking. In my submission, until that is cleared up, the evidence should not be taken.

THE PRESIDENT: We would permit him to say what HIROTA told him about that, if we are consistent.

in my submession, it would not be inconsistent with previous rulings to refuse to allow that to be done.

Hearsay has frequently been admitted, but not, as far as I know, in a case where the person from whom it was obtained is present in court and capable of giving evidence.

THE PRESIDENT: A delicate question arises as

3 4

5

7

8

10

12

14

13

15

17

18

20

21

23

25

to whether we should refuse to permit hearsay in order to force an accused into the box.

MR. COMYNS CARR: Your Honor, in my submission, it is not a question of forcing him into the box. It is a question of giving him the choice of going into the box or not having the evidence. What is happening --

THE PRESIDENT: That would force him into the box, perhaps; that would be to exert pressure.

MR. COMYNS CARR: What my friend is seeking to do now is get his evidence in at secondhand without cross-examination.

THE PRESIDENT: That has been happening throughout the individual cases. This is the first time it has been sharply raised.

What my Colleagues think, I do not know; and I am not prepared to make any pronouncement without consulting them.

To raise this question, I will ask him: Was he resent at the conversations to which he deposes, that is, between Ambassador Craigie and the accused HIROTA?

MR. YAMAOKA: Is it the desire of the Tribunal that I ask it, or did I hear correctly --

THE PRESIDENT: Will the witness answer?
Was he present at those conversations?

10.

THE WITNESS: I did not attend on every occasion.

THE PRESIDENT: Well, what he says about the conversations he did not hear could only be from hearsay, from somebody that was present, and if you press him to answer as to conversations which he did not hear, then I shall take the views of my Colleagues as to whether such questions should be permitted.

MR. YAMAOKA: If the Tribunal please -THE PRESIDENT: I understand such answers are
objected to -- such questions are objected to by Mr.
Comyns Carr.

MR. YAMAOKA: I had intended, if your Honor please, before the witness commenced giving the answer, asking further questions to lay the foundation for his answer, and I should like to be permitted to ask a further question of this witness which will probably clear that question up.

escenting and races allow any communities. Continue

2

3

5

6

8

10

11

12

14

15 16

17

18

19 20

21

22

24

BY MR. YAMAOKA (Continued):

Q Did Mr. HIROTA report to you the conversations that he held with Ambassador Craigie?

A I always heard the Foreign Minister's reports -The Foreign Minister always told me about these matters.

Also, Ambassador Craigie himself later told me that

"On such and such a day I had had such and such a

conversation with Mr. HIROTA -- on some occasions."

Q And did you receive those reports from Mr. HIROTA in your official capacity?

A Yes, as Foreign Vice-Minister it was my duty to keep in very close touch with the Foreign Minister on all such matters in the line of my official duties.

MR. YAMAOKA: Now, in the light of this foundation, if the Tribunal please, does it still desire that the question of hearsay be further argued?

THE PRESIDENT: If he says he heard the report of the conversation from HIROTA, we have to decide whether we will allow evidence of what the conversation was to be given.

MR. YAMAOKA: If the Tribunal please, the witness had already enswered that he received these reports and held these conversations with Mr. HIROTA in his official capacity, and under such circumstances, I think the application of the hearsay rule has a little different

2

4

5

7

8

9

10

11

12

14

15 16

17

18

20

21

23

25

BY MR. YAMAOKA (Continued):

Q Did Mr. HIROTA report to you the conversations that he held with Ambassador Craigie?

A I always heard the Foreign Minister's reports -The Foreign Minister always told me about these matters.

Also, Ambassador Craigie himself later told me that
"On such and such a day I had had such and such a
conversation with Mr. HIROTA -- on some occasions."

Q And did you receive those reports from Mr. HIROTA in your official capacity?

A Yes, as Foreign Vice-Minister it was my duty to keep in very close touch with the Foreign Minister on all such matters in the line of my official duties.

MR. YAMAOKA: Now, in the light of this foundation, if the Tribunal please, does it still desire that the question of hearsay be further argued?

THE PRESIDENT: If he says he heard the report of the conversation from HIROTA, we have to decide whether we will allow evidence of what the conversation was to be given.

MR. YAMAOKA: If the Tribunal please, the witness had already answered that he received these reports and held these conversations with Mr. HIROTA in his official capacity, and under such circumstances, I think the application of the hearsay rule has a little different

tenor.

THE PRESIDENT: We are not bound by any rules of evidence, by any rules of procedure, but we do get the best evidence that we can in all circumstances.

MR. YAMAOKA: I wish to add, if the Tribunal please, that during the entire course of these proceedings, the Tribunal has often received hearsay and further testimony based on hearsay, also. And many witnesses heretofore produced by the prosecution as well as by the defense have testified as to conversations they have had with many of the accused, and under --

THE PRESIDENT: By a majority hearsay will not be admitted in such circumstances.

If you are relying on what HIROTA told the witness, that witness will not be allowed to give that evidence. HIROTA must give that evidence, if it is given at all.

MR. YAMAOKA: Well, if the Tribunal please, in the light of the importance of this question to the other accused, I should desire to have the permission of the Tribunal to have the defense counsel confer on this matter and present a full argument on it at a later date before a full Tribunal.

THE PRESIDENT: We are not averse to hearing you fully. I think we all want to hear you fully, Mr.

Yamaoka. This is a matter of such serious importance that we should have the views of the defense as a whole put to us, and, as I am reminded, those of the prosecution also.

MR. YAMAOKA: That is my view of the matter, 6 and that is the reason why I asked permission to have 7 this matter considered by the defense as a whole and then the matter argued fully tomorrow morning, let us say.

THE PRESIDENT: Mr. Comyns Carr.

MR. COMYNS CARR: Your Honor, I would just 12 like to make this clear: We have not raised objection 13 to witness' stating that one of the accused expressed 14 his policy to the witness, because there the policy is 15 the fact to be proved and a witness -- although it is not so, may not carry so much weight with the Tribunal as if the accused said it himself -- such a statement is one which the witness is capable of making of his own knowledge that HIROTA, say, or any other accused declared his policy to be so and so. But, when it comes to proving a fact such as a conversation or meeting which took place in the absence of the witness and his source of knowledge is a person who is sitting in court, whether in the dock or out of it, then, in our submission, that is relaxing the hearsay rule to an altogether unreasonable extent and

9

10

11

it is that point and that point only that I took objection to. THE PRESIDENT: I think we better stand the 3 witness down until we have decided this point on further 5 argument. MR. YAMAOKA: If the Tribunal please, I could 7 withhold asking further questions along this line and have my learned friend here continue with cross-examination on other points in the affidavit. THE PRESIDENT: At this late hour it is not 10 desirable to do that. We will adjourn until half-past nine tomorrow 12 morning. 13 (Whereupon, at 1555, an adjournment was 14 taken until Wednesday, 1 October 1947, at 0930.) 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25